Volume IV, No. 1] [January, 1932

JOURNAL

OF THE

MADRAS UNIVERSITY

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY

MADRAS

PRINTED AT THE DIOCESAN PRESS, VEPERY

1932

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GOETHE—HIS LIFE AND WORK.

GOETHE CENTENARY MEMORIAL LECTURE[1]

'On August 28th 1749 at noon, as the clock was striking 12, I was born in Frankfort-on-the-Main. The constellation was propitious: the sun had reached the zenith, and was in the sign of the Virgin; Jupiter and Venus were looking on sympathetically; Saturn and Mars were indifferent.' In these words Goethe tells us the story of his birth and, by anticipation, of his life, using in his own way astrological formulæ. The sun had reached the zenith—Goethe is the most brilliant representative of the Age of Enlightenment, and through him its light is being handed down to generations who no longer hold its tenets nor are thrilled by its hopes. Wars and disasters, represented by Mars and Saturn, there were during his life-time, but they did not affect him much, his career was not broken, his thought was in but a small degree influenced by them. Human greatness (Jupiter) and human love (Venus) are most conspicuous.

Goethe, indeed, is the advocate of a life lived for its own intrinsic worth; to heal its ills the resources of the human mind and soul are considered sufficient. Such a message is addressed to all men; it transcends the bounds of nationality, it is unmindful of the lapse of time. Indeed, from the first, Goethe was read and admired in foreign countries, and the conqueror of Germany, Napoleon, visited Geothe to show him his appreciation of his works. Thus it is meet that we in India should also remember him and gather here on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of his death.

Goethe's native town Frankfort is one of the most attractive cities in Germany. Prosperous, gay, easily accessible, it was, moreover, in former days the place where emperors were crowned, and as a boy Goethe saw the pomp displayed on such an occasion.

His parents were well-to-do, his mother being a Burgomaster's daughter, and the home was not only cultured in the

[1] *Delivered on the 22nd March 1932 by Dr. P. E. Burckhardt with the Vice-Chancellor, Diwan Bahadur K. Ramunni Menon M.A. (Cantab.), in the chair.*

ordinary sense, but his father and mother were actively interested in the progress of literature, and new books of note were eagerly read and discussed. The chief educative factor, however, was the mother's influence. 'From her I have my cheerfulness,' the poet says, and what this cheerfulness implied the mother herself once explained: 'I have received this grace from God that nobody ever went away from me dissatisfied. I have a great love for all human beings; I do not preach morals to them, I always try to see the bright side of a man's character.' Here we see the human touch, the kindliness, the sweetness of a woman, cheering, uplifting many. Goethe's mother calls this attitude of hers a gift bestowed upon her by God's grace. Goethe accepts the gift (which he inherited), but he too easily forgets the Giver. Personal religion, to him, is no more to be one of the essentials of life.

Up to his 17th year Goethe lived in Frankfort, with his parents. Every care was taken to develop his intellect; private tuition was provided. Thus, perhaps, a certain egotism, a certain feeling of self-importance was engendered, which he never got rid of altogether. His father's house was frequented by many of the best men in the town, and listening to their conversation the clever boy's mind was enriched.

He once got into hot water through a boyish love for a girl of lower social rank, and only the influence of friends of the family saved him from public disgrace. As a lad of seventeen he went to Liepsic to study law. But Law was never to captivate his mind fully. He heard lectures on many other subjects as well, especially on literature. He also plunged into the gaieties of German students' life. Auerbach's wine-vault was frequented by him, and he was only too well acquainted with its revelries. He returned to Frankfort with impaired health. After more than a year's rest he went to Strassburg in Alsace to finish his studies. In due course he passed his examinations. His genius as a poet had already begun to manifest itself. For a short time he was a nationalist: he went so far as to declare that Gothic architecture was Teutonic, which is not true. He also wrote a drama in praise of a 15th century knight-errant Goetz von Berlichingen, which aroused wild enthusiasm. But his mind soon turned back to themes of general human interest. I refer to *Werther's Leiden*—'The Sufferings of Werther,'—a small book (of 100 pages) which

made his name known all over Europe. The story of Werther is Goethe's own story, all but the tragic end. 'Werther's Leiden' is rightly famous. It breathes a freshness of sentiment, a directness, which is unsurpassed in any other work of Goethe's, and Werther is in a singular contrast to that other great figure of his art, Faust the philosopher, the springs of whose heart have dried up and who is bartering away his soul to get something to fill its emptiness.

Werther is a young man who by nature seems destined to happiness; he has the gift of being able to enjoy things beautiful and lovely around him. He plays with children and is worshipped by them, he wins the confidence of simple people in the villages, brushing aside conventionalities and artificial barriers. Nature to him is full of song and harmony. And then he meets Charlotte—Charlotte, the embodiment of all that is pure and lovely, but she cannot permit herself to fall in love with him, as she is engaged to be married to another man.

From the first Werther feels that the situation is hopeless; but for some time he deludes himself into the belief that he can follow his inclination, see Charlotte and be her friend, without intruding into the rights of others and destroying harmony and good feeling. For is not Charlotte so wonderfully natural in her behaviour towards him? She never betrays the trust reposed in her by Albert, her absent fiancé, but she fully accepts Werther as a friend and spends happy hours with him. More than that: when her fiancé comes he makes friends with Werther, feeling attracted to him as Charlotte had been, and it seems that 'Reine Menschlichkeit' i.e., man allowed to follow his natural instincts, can defy the conventions of society and can find its way unaided by the dictates of Providence. But what happens? Werther is held spellbound by the loftiness of Charlotte's feelings; 'She is sacred to me' he exclaims, 'in her presence desire is silenced. When I hear her sing a certain song, all anguish, all confusion vanishes, and I breathe freely once again.'

She is sacred to me, he says. But this awe, this reluctance to intrude slowly wears off. Charlotte is true to herself, and she expects Werther to respect the divine laws which she herself obeys, but Werther has only his human feelings to be

guided by, his claim to happiness, and how can the latter ever be satisfied? He leaves them for a time, unable to stand the daily torment of Albert's prsence; but soon he returns, unable to keep away from Charlotte altogether. He finds them husband and wife. The romance is at an end. Werther ought to reconcile himself to facts, but he cannot, nor can Charlotte yield to his entreaties; there is no way out; life has ceased to be of any value to him, so he chooses death.

This is Goethe's first great message of the power, the uplifting power, the restraining power of pure womanhood. To come back to Goethe's life-story, his writing 'Werther' relieved his mind, and he was only too ready to admire and flirt with girls elsewhere. He did not get married until late in life; there seems to have been with him a sort of inability to surrender himself either to a great cause or to another human being. Conscious of the riches of his own mind and heart, he feared to lose any part of himself, and thus failed to possess that life to which there is access only by self-surrender. One maiden in Alsace he left having broken her heart: she had given her all to him; he just played with her for a time and then left.

About that time he received a call to settle in Weimar, at the court of Augustus, Duke of Saxony-Weimar. Nominally it was to be an appointment to one of the higher posts in the Secretariat of this small state, but the Duke's real purpose was to add to the lusture of his house and to give a great poet leisure to fulfil a poet's task. In Weimar Goethe found another poet, F. Schiller, whose fame is second to Goethe's only. Weimar thus became the Athens, the Rome of Germany. It was there that Goethe, in advanced years, married a girl of the artisan class, Christine Vulpius, to whom he had one day taken a fancy. This marriage was, however, merely a conventional affair, and bears no connection with Goethe's achievements as a poet. Long before he came to know Christine he had found, in Weimar, women from whom he drew inspiration; chief among them was Frau von Stein, the wife of an official. She was older than he, and her maturer judgment often kept him from making a *faux pas*, and damped his ardour. It was she, more than any one else, who fashioned his ideas on the greatness of womanhood, and she is immortalized in several of the heroines of his great

plays. In Weimar Goethe wrote his greatest works. We will proceed to consider them.

Iphigenia in Tauris

Iphigenia, the daughter of Agamemnon, was to have been offered as a sacrifice to the gods, to secure favourable winds for the ships which carried the Greek army to Troy. But Diana, the virgin goddess wraps her in a cloud and translates her to Tauris in a semi-barbarian northern country (on the shores of the Black Sea) and there makes her the priestess of her shrine. As priestess, a virgin priestess, she changes the cruel customs of the barbarians, she puts a stop to human sacrifice, saving the lives of the strangers whose ships are wrecked on that dangerous coast. Deprived of everything a woman would desire for herself, she accomplishes what only a woman could accomplish, and savage men yield to her sway. The fact that she is an exile makes it perhaps easier for her to fulfil this task:

> '.................nor ever here
> Does my unquiet spirit feel at home,
> And day by day upon the shore I stand,
> The land of Hellas seeking with my soul.'

Her soul is not in danger of being carried away by commonplace ambitions and her thoughts wander back to her home and the sweet fellowship of brothers and sisters. She is untouched, untainted by the grosser passions that waken when childhood ends. But though Iphigenia's 'soul remains locked in the deep recesses of her breast,' her attractiveness has not escaped the notice of King Thoas. He had first loved her as a father when from nowhere she had come to the sacred grove, but now he looks on her as his consort-to-be, and in the first act of the play he comes to offer to Iphigenia his heart and his throne. True, the king's speech is not the appeal of a passionate lover. He describes his lonely life and his somewhat selfish desire for happiness; as a king wont to rule and to decide, he expects Iphigenia to fall in with his proposals. But she recoils. She is not meant to be a king's bride. She longs for her home. When day after day

she hopes for an opportunity to return to Hellas, how could she accept a tie that would make her exile a permanent one? And then there is another thing which makes her shrink from marriage: her origin—'Attend! I issue from the Titans' race,' she exclaims, from the race that rebelled against heaven and ventured to attack the gods. All through her family history there is seen rebellion against the divine rule: it is one long gruesome story of hatred, war, and murder. But the king persists. He knows Iphigenia. She has broken 'the band of brass which Jupiter forged round their brow;' she is not the embodiment of the destructive powers of a blind destiny, she is a dispenser of blessings, she is free to do good. He persists in his endeavours to win her, but to no purpose. Finally getting angry, he leaves her, and the old savage spirit taking hold of the barbarian's mind once more he vows that he will revert to the bloody practices of former days. 'A man of noble mind may oft be led by woman's gentle word,' but what if the woman refuses herself to the man? Is not her influence gone, and will not Iphigenia perish as a victim of desires too lofty, too unworldly? And the king's opportunity has come: two foreigners have been found on the shore. 'I shall send them to Diana's grove,' he says,'and let the goddess once again receive the offering which she has missed all these years.'

These foreigners are Pylades and Orestes. The latter is Iphigenia's brother; he has killed his mother to avenge her crime; she, an adultress, had murdered her husband, the father of Orestes (and Iphigenia). But terrible as was his mother's guilt, his is as great, and he is pursued by the Furies and expects soon to meet with his fate and to descend to Hades. His friend Pylades is more hopeful: he has heard that the guardian of the shrine is a woman:

> 'That it is a woman is ground for hope;
> On her we may depend
> In good or evil with more certainty.'

Here Goethe speaks from his own experience. His life was most blest when he was under the influence of a noble woman, and Frau von Stein in Weimar was to him, in the years in which he was working at this drama, an Iphigenia, a priestess of lofty thought.

The situation threatens to become too much even for Iphigenia: Orestes is driven mad by remorse and regret. But lo! a sister's love is not repelled by Orestes' misery and guilt. She does not turn from him, and her tender embrace is for him a blessing from the realm of light; the powers of darkness have lost their hold on him: so long as he is near the sacred shrine the threatening voices of the Furies are no more heard:

> 'The dread Eumenides at length retire,
> The brazen gates of Tartarus I hear
> Behind them closing with a thunderous clang.'

But if Orestes is being freed, taken out of the clutches of the powers of darkness, Thoas the king is not, and with ever-growing impatience he claims the sacrifice, the death of the priestess's brother! Pylades has a plan to save them from destruction—Iphigenia is to tell the king that the idol must be bathed in the sea before the sacrifice takes place, nobody being allowed to watch the ceremony. Their ship will be waiting near the shore to receive Iphigenia. To carry out this plan would serve two purposes—first, to make good their escape, and second, to fulfil the command Orestes had received from the god Apollo before starting on his voyage, viz. to bring back to Hellas the *Sister*, which he interprets as referring to Apollo's sister, Diana, or rather, to Diana's image. Iphigenia at first acquiesces. But suddenly she recoils:

> 'Detested falsehood: it does not relieve
> The breast like words of truth;
> It comforts not,
> But is a torment in the forger's heart
> And like an arrow which a god directs
> Flies back and wounds the archer.'

She decides to tell the king everything and to appeal to his mercy, to his chivalry. To carry off the idol and to deceive the king would mean adding another link to the chain which binds her race to the furies of hell. Will not the gods of heaven come and help? Meanwhile the king has heard a rumour of the intended flight and arrives on the scene, angry, to claim his due before it is too late. But Iphigenia refuses to be browbeaten:

> 'But nor then nor now
> Have I been taught compliance with the voice
> And savage mandates of a man.'

She boldly speaks to the mighty one who has power over her life and who is coming at the head of an army. She too possesses weapons, a woman's weapons!

> 'Prayer, lovely prayer, fair branch in woman's hands,
> More potent far than instruments of war
> Thou dost thrust back..............'

And another weapon is her sincerity. She reveals the plot.

> 'Destroy us if thou dar'st!'

But he dare not; he sees the reasonableness of their longing to go home and to take the sister home too. Can he refuse to them even the idol which they believe will purify their blood-stained house?

The advent of Orestes almost wrecks her conciliatory plans. Seeing the king, the enemy as he thinks, he draws the sword. Again Iphigenia has to pacify. At last Orestes understands: when the god Apollo told him to bring home the sister from the far-off shore, he meant his, Orestes' sister, not the image of Diana, the sister of Apollo. She, the embodiment of Beauty and Truth, she will remove the curse, she will purify the blood-stained hearth.

The king is overcome. He allows them to depart; he sends them off with a word of blessing.

Iphigenia has achieved the salvation of all. She, the pure woman-soul, has broken the curse and has kept them from wrong-doing and guilt.

Another great drama of the early years in Weimar is

Torquato Tasso.

Torquato Tasso like Iphigenia extols pure womanhood, that has conquered itself and shines forth in almost unearthly splendour. But between the two dramas there is a world of difference. Iphigenia brings healing to a tortured soul, Tasso, on the other hand, is the victim of his love to Leonora: The drama describes the life of Torquato Tasso, the author of *Gerusalemme Liberata*, at the court of Ferrara in Italy. The Renaissance is at its height. The ancient civilization of Greece and Rome have yielded their riches to the admiring

mind of man. Virgil is more loved than the mediæval saints and his bust adorns the garden of the palace of Belrigardo where the scene of the drama is laid. The ambition of each prince is to have at his court a poet, whose talents and achievements outshine those of the poets at rival courts. Ferrara has Torquato Tasso, and at last the poet hands over to his patron the manuscript of his great poem. The Duke is overjoyed. His patronage has borne abundant fruit, and in princely generosity, he wishes to crown the poet's brow with the token of his admiration, and his sister, princess Leonora, takes from Virgil the garland she had woven herself and approaches Tasso.

Tasso's measure of happiness is overflowing and the favour of Leonora seems to open a brighter prospect still. He is not ashamed to own it, the most noble thoughts which his poems give expression to have been inspired by her, they are true, because in her they are a reality. Yea, through her the divine has been revealed to him. Will thus the touch of pure womanhood lift him up higher and higher?

He thinks so. Leonora cautions him; 'You men love us,' she says; 'What do you love?'

> 'Beauty is transient which alone ye seem
> To hold in honour...... ....
> If among men there were who knew to prize
> The heart of woman, who could recognise
> What treasures of fidelity and love
> Are garnered safely in a woman's breast,
> If the possession which should satisfy
> Waken'd no restless cravings in your hearts'

And again—certain things can only become our own 'through moderation and wise self-restraint'. These are golden words; but do they carry conviction? Rather, do they give strength to carry these noble principles into practice? Leonora's sympathy is in strong contrast to a rather cold welcome Tasso receives at the hands of Antonio, a brilliant diplomat just back from a successful political mission; his offer of friendship to Antonio meets with a rebuff, and the scene ends with Tasso challenging Antonio with the sword. The coming of the Duke puts a stop to the quarrel. But the poet's behaviour was incorrect and a light punishment is inflicted, and Tasso's

mind is filled with dark suspicions. The latter part of the play centres in the attempt made by Leonora the princess and Leonora Sanvitale to conciliate Antonio and Tasso. Leonora Sanvitale is a friend to the Duke, and a would-be patroness of Tasso. Antonio is made to apologise for his rudeness. Leonora Sanvitale offers to take Tasso to other places to refresh his mind, in reality to enjoy his company and earn praise for her interests towards the poet. Tasso listens gratefully to these offers, a little overcome by the successive happenings of that one day in which he was both honoured and dishonoured as never before. But though the contretemps is overcome his heart is not satisfied. Both Leonora Sanvitale and Leonara the princess have shown him all the kindness and delicacy of feeling a refined woman is capable of, but Tasso wants more, he wants the love of the woman who admires him; he cannot anymore restrain his love to the princess, he claims her as his bride but the princess is frightened and withdraws and the poet recognizes that he has broken the strict rules of court-etiquette and that his position in Ferrara is lost, irretrievably lost. No punishment is meted out to him but what is perhaps worse, pity.

And what is his error? To have loved a woman whose heart was attuned to his own. To have been lifted up high by her admiration and devotion, to have trusted her to follow the dictates of her heart as he was following his own. The drama ends in Tasso pouring out his soul in bitter complaints.

> 'And thou, too, siren, who so tenderly
> Didst lead me on with thy celestial mien
> Thee now I know! Wherefore, Oh God, so late?'

He soon recognizes that he is carried away by his feelings:

> 'My very bones are crushed, yet do I live
> Ay, live to feel the agonising pain......
> Despair enfolds me in its ruthless grasp
> And in the hell-pang that annihilates
> These slandrous words are but the feeble cry'

Where, then, is the gospel of uplifting womanhood!

Goethe, for some time, was unable to proclaim it. His relation to Frau von Stein in Weimar, after some years, became a torture to both. The lady bound by her position and bound

also by her loyalty to her husband, could not give to the passionate man what he demanded. And Goethe craving in turn for a platonic friendship and for a lover's reward brought both happiness and misery into the life of the woman he adored.

Goethe, several times, set out for journeys to Switzerland and to Italy and we have to remember that in days gone by journeys took long and were tedious. But Goethe was a lover of the antique world and of its Renaissance in the 15th century and his wanderings through Milan, Florence, Venice and Rome won his heart and mind to the ideas extolled by Aristotle and Praxitiles, and the second part of Faust is to a great extent an attempt to unite Teutonic art with the Grecian.

But again it would be impossible to characterise Goethe as an exponent of certain theories on art, he is much too human for that and his respect, his affection for man, for men in the ordinary walks of life is intense, he first made the life of common men and women the subject of great dramas and so let us now turn to Goethe's greatest work, the first part of Faust with its full emotional life.

The Faust legend can be traced back to centuries before Goethe and as a boy he read the popular version of the legend i.e., of the scholar who exchanged theology for magic art and in exchange for his soul got from the devil a more than ordinary knowledge of things and every sensual enjoyment.

In Goethe's drama the setting is different. It starts with a dialogue between God and Mephistopheles (name given to the evil one).

'What will you bet (Meph. asks) there's still a chance to gain him.

> 'If unto me full leave you give,
> Gently upon my road to train him !'
>
> The Lord.
>
> 'As long as he on earth shall live,
> So long I make no prohibition.
> While man's desire and aspirations stir,
> He cannot choose but err.

(This is in imitation of the first chapters of the Biblical book of Job). The pact of Faust with Mephisto must be understood

on the background of this providential care of the Lord for his erring child. So from the very start the deliverance of Faust from the seducer's power is forecast. The scholar and alchemist Faust is seen first in his study. He is through with all that man can teach and is disillusioned and woos himself to magic.

> 'I've studied now Philosophy
> And Jurisprudence, Medicine,......
> And even, alas! Theology,......
> From end to end, with labour keen;
> And here, poor fool! with all my lore
> I stand, no wiser than before;
> I'm Magister,—yea, Doctor—hight
> And straight or crosswise, wrong or right,
> These ten years long, with many woes,
> I've led my scholars by the nose,—
> And see, that nothing can be known
> That knowledge cuts me to the bone.'

> 'I'm cleverer, true, than those fops of teachers
> Doctors and Magisters, Scribes and Preachers;
> Neither scruples nor doubts come now to smite me,
> Nor Hell nor Devil can longer affright me.
> For this, all pleasure am I foregoing;
> I do not pretend to aught worth knowing,
> I do not pretend I could be a teacher
> To help or convert a fellow-creature.
> Then, too, I've neither lands nor gold,
> Nor the world's least pomp or honour hold—'

> 'No dog would endure such a curst existence!
> Wherefore, from Magic I seek assistance,
> That many a secret perchance I reach
> Through spirit-power and spirit speech,
> And thus the bitter task forego
> Of saying the things I do not know,—
> That I may detect the inmost force
> Which binds the world, and guides its course;
> Its germs, productive powers explore,
> And rummage in empty words no more!'

He conjures up the earth-spirit, the spirit of the multiform earthly Universe, or the spirit of History of the movement of

the Human Race (these are the explanations of the commentators) who introduces himself in the beautiful verses:

> 'In the tides of Life, in Action's storm
> A fluctuant wave,
> A shuttle free,
> Birth and the Grave,
> An eternal sea,
> A weaving, flowing
> Life, all-glowing,
> Thus at Time's humming loom 'tis my hand prepares
> The garment of Life which the Deity wears!'

Faust believes to be on a par with the spirit, but the spirit retorts:

> 'Thou'rt like the Spirit which thou comprehendest,
> Not me!'

so that Faust is thrown back on to the grosser, material views of life; he regrets his years of toil, his efforts to reach the realm of divine life. His eye is caught by the phial which contains the fluid that will end all earthly misery, his hand has seized it. But when he is about to drink, a mighty chorus is heard from the neighbouring cathedral. It is Easter, and the message of life from death is once more proclaimed to the world.

Faust is overcome. The sweet memories of childhood and a child's faith crowd in upon him. Although he complains 'your messages I hear but faith has not been given', still the conclusion is:

> 'Sound on, ye hymns of Heaven, so sweet and mild!
> My tears gush forth: the Earth takes back her child!'

Hymns of Heaven were required to save Faust from despair. But he is not going to make himself an offering to God, who saved him. His interest is entirely in this world. He craves enjoyments, coarse ones and refined ones. Mephistopheles comes to offer his services promising full satisfaction. The return payment which is to consist in the soul of Faust, need not be made at once. Faust falls in with the offer, assured that the devil never will be able to fulfil his part of the pact

> 'When on an idler's bed I stretch myself in quiet,
> There let, at once, my record end!
> Canst thou with lying flattery rule me,
> Until, self-pleased, myself I see,

'Canst thou with rich enjoyment fool me
Let that day be the last for me!
The bet I offer.........'

'.........And heartily
When thus I hail the Moment flying:
"Ah, still delay—thou art so fair!"
Then bind me in thy bonds undying,
My final ruin then declare!
Then let the death-bell chime the token,
Then art thou from thy service free!
The clock may stop, the hand be broken,
The time be finished unto me!'

Faust is first taken to a wineshop frequented by students, Auerbach's cellar where wine and more wine brings about a very real but very vulgar atmosphere of well-being

....................'We feel
So cannibalic jolly'

but Faust wants to leave. He is too good for such bestiality.

Faust is now taken to the witches' kitchen to be rejuvenated before he goes in for the best Mephisto has to offer. It is a coarse scene and by it Faust's approach to Margaret is vitiated.

The climax of the drama is reached in the figure of Margaret whom Goethe named after his first boyish love to a girl in Frankfort and here Goethe's message of the purifying influence of woman is proclaimed more forcefully, if somewhat more in a paradoxical form than anywhere else. Faust is the passionate, selfish, unscrupulous, lover; Margaret loves because she cannot withhold anything from him who has won her heart, because she cannot but trust him to whom she has entrusted her all. She loses her good name, her brother Valentine is killed in a vain attempt to avenge the dishonour of his sister. He is slain by Faust. At last she breaks down in shame and terror when in Church she hears the chorus heralding the Day of Judgement:

'Judex ergo com sedebit,
Quidquid latet, adparebit,
Nil inultum remanebit.

When the judge will sit for judgement
Every hidden thing will appear
Nothing will remain unavenged'

Margaret.

'I cannot breathe!
The massy pillars
Imprison me!
The vaulted arches
Crush me!.........Air!'

'Evil spirit.

Hide thyself! Sin and shame
Stay never hidden.
Air? Light?
Woe to thee!'

Chorus.

'Quid sum miser tunc dicturus,
Quem patronum rogaturus,
Cum vix justus sit securus
What shall I miserable one then say,
Which saint implore
When even the just will hardly be secure?'

'Evil spirit.

They turn their faces,
The glorified, from thee:
The pure, their hands to offer,
Shuddering, refuse thee;
Woe!'

Chorus.

'Quid sum miser tunc dicturus......'

Margaret.

'Neighbour! your cordial!'

Once more we find Faust in the ignoble society of witches where however he can find no relief from the torments of remorse. Margaret meanwhile, is thrown into prison for murdering her child and poisoning her mother with a sleeping-draught and she goes out of her mind.

Faust, with keys provided by Mephisto comes to release her; when she recognizes the voice of her beloved the devilish obsession of the fear of hell vanishes

' 'Tis I'

Margaret.

' 'Tis I'
' 'Tis he! 'tis he! Where now is all my pain?

The anguish of the dungeon, and the chain?
'Tis thou! Thou comest to save me,
And I am saved!—
Again the street I see
Where first I looked on thee;
And the garden, brightly blooming,
Where I and Martha wait thy coming'

but again there is something in Faust that is repulsive to her.

'Thy dear, dear hand! But, ah, 'tis wet!
Why, wipe it off! Methinks that yet
There's blood thereon.
Ah, God! what hast thou done?
Nay, sheathe thy sword at last!
Do not affray me!'

And Margaret, unable to follow him fills her mind with pictures of her doom and death from the executioner's hand. The crisis comes with Mephisto's appearance. Guilty as she is, she is not yet in the devil's possession, she commends herself to God's righteous judgement:

'Thine am I, Father! rescue me!
Ye angels, holy cohorts, guard me,
Camp around, and from evil ward me!
Henry! I shudder to think of thee.'

She is judged, cries Mephistopheles. But a voice from above is heard, 'She is saved'.

So, Margaret emerges in wonderful purity, although not in innocence, from the terrible ordeal, and it is in tune with the spirit of Part I of Faust, that in Part II she appears as a penitent and is pardoned and that Faust is snatched away from the very jaws of hell; the angels soar into the higher atmosphere carrying the immortal part of Faust:

'The noble spirit now is free
And saved from evil scheming,
Who ever aspires unweariedly
Is not beyond redeeming;
And if he feels the grace of love
That from on High is given
The blessed Hosts that wait above
Shall welcome him to heaven.'

This is by universal consent, Goethe's 'Welt-anschauung,' his creed. Faust has overcome because he never ceased to aspire after better things.

Mephisto's gifts never were satisfying to him. Goethe's message is reasserted in the closing lines of Faust:

> 'All things transitory
> But as symbols are sent.
> Earth's insufficiency
> Here grows to Event.
> The indescribable
> Here it is done;
> The woman's soul leadeth us
> Upward and on.'

Having acquainted ourselves so far with Goethe's thought we must ask one more question. What are his views on religion? For each man in the last resort is worth what his religion is worth. This is a much discussed problem and various schools of thought claim him as their own. I have come to the following conclusion; Goethe was a religious man, if the term is taken in a general sense. He once said: 'Lack of faith makes people weak, petty and retrograde.' And again: 'People are productive only as long as they are religious. Margaret once questions Faust about his beliefs and Faust replies:

> 'Hear me not falsely, sweetest countenance.
> Who dare express Him?
> And who profess Him,
> Saying: I believe in Him!
> Who, feeling, seeing,
> Deny His being,
> Saying: I believe Him not!
> The All-enfolding,
> The All-upholding,
> Folds and upholds he not
> Thee, me, Himself?
> Arches not there the sky above us?
> Lies not beneath us, firm, the earth?
> And rise not, on us shining,
> Friendly, the everlasting stars?
> Look I not, eye to eye, on thee
> And feel'st not, thronging
> To head and heart, the force,

> Still weaving its eternal secret
> Invisible, visible, around thy life?
> Vast as it is, fill with that force thy heart,
> And when thou in the feeling wholly blessed art,
> Call it, then, what thou wilt,—
> I have no name to give it!
> Feeling is all in all:
> The Name is sound and smoke,
> Obscuring Heaven's clear glow.'

Margaret is not satisfied:

> 'Some hitch in it there must be
> For thou hast no Christianity.'

How far was Goethe a Christian? He was a Christian to the extent of believing in a Providence, in an Almighty Creator and Ruler. He was a Christian in assigning to Christian faith a power for good which no other thing has: one instance we have noticed: it was the Easter Hymn that turned back to life the despairing thoughts of Faust. Another instance is found in his novel: 'The Apprenticeship of William Meister.' A young girl Mignon after a life of misery, dies a sudden and sad death. How to explain this? But Mignon was not comfortless: at the funeral the priest shows, on her arm, the image of a crucifix. She found strength in the contemplation of the crucified Saviour.

Goethe held genuine Christians in high esteem and sought their company. But having a true insight into the nature of Christian faith he recognized that Christian faith is an exacting thing. And he was not willing to pay the price. Life, unregenerated life, had too many attractions for him, had in store for him too much greatness and glory. He was too sure of himself to stake his all upon a life he had not lived, and a death he had not died. He says, as quoted before that he who aspires unweariedly is not beyond redeeming. This is self-redemption or at least self-appointed redemption. The fact of sin, of the awful sinfulness of sin he did not accept; so he did not need a redeemer. His gospel was the gospel of humanity, and the leader of humanity to higher regions was to be the woman soul, the eternal feminine (to give the literal translation), the uplifting power of noble womanhood.

Goethe's sympathy with all things human made him take interest in a multitude of things, natural history and science being among the favourite subjects he pondered over. He produced e.g. a new theory on the origin of colour. He had no national prejudices. He admired Shakespeare as much as any Englishman; his mind went out to the Eastern peoples and he delighted in the masterpieces of Persian and Indian poetry. He does not seem to have read the Vedas, Mahabharatha and Ramayana, but he must have known that they existed; he was particularly attracted by Kalidas. Of Sakuntala he says:—

'Wilt thou give a name to what charms the mind and satisfies it, to the flower that adorns the early days of the year and to the fruit that blesses its latter days, to heaven and earth in one, say Sakuntala, and thou hast named all this.' Again it is the humaneness of Sakuntala's character that Goethe admires. In an atmosphere vitiated by the curse of a Sanyasi and the etiquette of a court there lives Sakuntala, a true noble woman. He also mentions *Meghaduta* and *Nala* as worthy of high praise; on the other hand he had no sympathy with Indian sculpture. It appears to him grotesque with its monstrous shapes and its lack of moderation. He is also much concerned with the abject condition of the Pariah. And in one of his ballads a Pariah implores Brahman to explain to him the cause of his misery. The God's reply, in the form of a legend, is that none is so pure as to be above falling and none so depraved as to be unfit for moral uplift. Having thus received ground for hope the Pariah is satisfied. Goethe being free from national or racial bias, every nation and every race can enjoy his works and profit by them. But as his final standards are nature and beauty rather than the things that are higher than man, many of us will pause before entrusting ourselves to his leadership. To me, the light of life does not come from him but to Goethe I do owe broadened views, emancipation from everything petty. He is a corrective against any belittling of human values.

Goethe has left many works, and I have not mentioned even all the important ones. I have omitted his smaller poems too especially the lyrical ones in which he excels and the epigrams full of deep wisdom. Goethe lived in Weimar

until his death. He was the recognized prince among poets and was held in universal veneration. As years went on he became more and more solitary. Even his only son died before him, in 1830. Still he does not lose touch with his fellow men. He exchanges letters with Byron, Walter Scott, Carlyle. He is interested in the idea of a Suez canal.

On the 17th of March 1832 Goethe fell ill with a cold and on the 22nd he died. But his death has not removed him from men. His works are read, his sayings quoted, his message is discussed. In this era of mass production he reminds us that we are nothing unless we have individuality. Among the machines and machine-made things of the present day he extols the mind and the culture of the mind. He was great but easy of approach, and so he is to-day in many of his works and the best homage we can bring him is to go to him and enrich ourselves with the treasures of his genius.

INDIA'S GOLD EXPORTS*

BY

P. J. THOMAS, M.A., B.Litt., Ph.D.
University Professor of Economics.

During the last five months, gold exports of the value of about Rs. 51 crores have left this country. This efflux of gold has evoked much criticism among the Indian politicians and even the common folk are led to believe that something very disastrous has happened. The Government of India, on the contrary, has congratulated itself on certain achievements which were rendered possible by the efflux of gold. And the authorities in Britain have expressed a profound sense of relief and even pride at what has happened. Such divergence of views has given rise to a certain amount of bewilderment among the people, and it has become necessary to enquire into the causes and results of the gold exports.

At the outset, let us see why gold is exported. It is chiefly because gold has appreciated in terms of sterling and the rupee. Before the abandonment of the gold standard, a sovereign was worth 20 shillings, but subsequently when sterling depreciated, the sovereign (i.e. gold) went up in price and was recently sold at 30 shillings in England. In India a tola of gold to-day fetches above Rs. 29, but the price at which Government treasury would purchase it is only Rs. 21-3-10. There is therefore a difference of about Rs. 8 per tola (about 37 per cent) between the statutory price and the actual price, and naturally the hoarder and the bullion-dealer sell their gold abroad. Nor is it only in India that the gold market is booming. It is reported from England that there is a rush for the sale of sovereigns and treasured articles made of gold; and even in France, whose currency is not depreciated, old gold coins are coming up for sale by weight.

The export of gold from India is, however, more striking. Even before the abandonment of the gold standard, much 'distress' gold was finding its way to the Paper Currency Reserve but of a total of Rs. 13 crores that thus came in, only one crore had been exported. But after the abandonment of the gold standard on September 21, the small rill began to grow into a brook, the exports having

* Lecture delivered before the Madras Economic Association on 7th March, 1932. The export figures have since mounted up to about sixty crores.

averaged about 1·8 crore a week during the months of October and November; it then became a fairly big stream in December, with an average weekly export of 3·7 crores. The stream began to contract in January, and during the last three weeks, gold exports averaged only 1½ crores. Although a good part of our exports went to England in the first instance, it was not England that purchased our gold, but the United States, France and other countries on the gold standard. They are only too pleased to obtain gold in exchange for sterling, which has been depreciating.

SOME MISCONCEPTION.

As we will see presently, the efflux of gold from India has certain undesirable features, but the popular opposition to it is based on two or three misconceptions. First, there is a sneaking Bullionism in this opposition, a belief that gold is wealth *par excellence* and must not be parted with on any account. It is too late in the day to refute Bullionism, but, however crushingly we may refute it, it will not die. Like many superstitions, it dies hard. Secondly, there is a misconception that the growing power of the U. S. A. and France is due to their greedy absorption of gold. Indeed those two countries have recently attracted a good deal of gold from outside, but it was not because their governments deliberately went about grabbing gold from all over the world, but because the people of U. S. A. and France did not like to leave their monies (or dues) in other countries (except on short-term). They had lost confidence in the finances and in the currencies of certain countries where their money lay and quite naturally they insisted on payment, and gold being the ultimate international medium of exchange, it had to be exported to clear the debts. Whether this lack of confidence is justified is another matter, and does not concern us here. The point to be borne in mind is that the gold flow to these countries did not prevent their suffering by the trade slump. There is more unemployment in the United States than elsewhere.

Thirdly, there is an important misconception in regard to the rôle played by gold in India. The principal function of gold in Western countries has been to support credit and to settle foreign exchange transactions. After the War when gold currency has fallen into desuetude, gold is chiefly needed to meet the temporary deficiencies in the balance of international payments. Much of the non-industrial gold has thus found its way into the vaults of central banks. Of the gold stock of £160 millions in Britain before the War, only 52 per cent was in the Bank of England, the rest having been in other banks or in circulation; but to-day most of it is in the Bank's vaults, and supports 170 per cent more

credit than it did before the War. The same is the position in most other countries. When there is need for gold to be shipped abroad, it is the gold in the central banks that is drawn upon and this serves as an indicator of the state of international exchange. When such drain is serious, the mechanism of the bank rate and other devices are set in motion to block up the drain.

But gold fulfils a very different rôle in India. Indeed, in India too, Government has got some gold reserve, but the amount held in the gold standard reserve and paper currency reserve put together (about £30 millions) is only a fraction of the total gold in this country. The great bulk of it is hoarded in houses and temples, or displayed as jewels and ornaments. Gold is not here what it is in other countries, a convenient reserve to support credit and foreign exchange; it is not an instrument to be called into service whenever there is a national need, but an inert and immobile mass, which cannot serve any such national purpose. By continued absorption for centuries, India has accumulated gold worth not less than 1,000 crores: an amount which is nearly equal to the non-monetary gold in the rest of the world. During the last 30 years alone, the accumulation in India has been Rs. 550 crores (Rs. 700 crores at present prices), and during the 10 years 1920–29, India absorbed as much as 25 per cent of the new gold. In fact, India has got nearly as much gold as the much-envied U.S.A.; but with this important difference that while the American gold stock is a national asset of great potency, an armament which could be mobilised at the will of Government in the interests of the country, the Indian gold is an inert mass, which gives no power to the people; it has done little to improve their economic prospects. With the largest accumulated wealth in gold, India has to-day the lowest *per capita* income in the world.

Thus, let us remember that the gold exported from the country is from the private hoards so accumulated, and not from the stock in the Government reserves. Further, the gold exported was not given away for nothing, but was converted into mobile and serviceable wealth and has substantially helped to ease the strain on the State Exchequer. It has also incidentally helped Britain to tide over her financial difficulties. We will see how all this was done.

The Benefits from Gold Exports.

At the time when the gold standard was abandoned, Government was faced with three important difficulties. *Firstly*, since the adoption of the 18*d.* ratio in 1927, Government had pursued a policy of currency contraction, and reduced currency during the last 24 months to Rs. 43½ crores. Not only businessmen but also politicians

and economists have been inveighing against the rigid regimen of currency contraction, and many of the industrial and financial ills of the time were attributed to it. *Secondly*, Government had been faced with a very unfavourable balance of trade and had sold reverse councils to the extent of 14 millions in so short a period as 4 months. *Thirdly*, Government had been straining hard to find resources for paying off the sterling debt of £15 millions which was to fall due on 15th January. Even to pay the normal home charges for the year (£33·3 millions) Government was in difficulties. This produced an unenviable situation for Government and also disturbed the peace of the tax-payer, who in the last resort has to bear Government's burdens. Like Mr. Micawber, the Government of India waited 'for something to turn up.'

And something did turn up and that something was the opening of the gold hoards. It gave the much-needed relief to Government, *firstly* by reversing the unfavourable balance of trade, *secondly*, by enabling the due discharge of the sterling debt and reducing the floating debts and *thirdly*, by bringing about the much-desired expansion of currency. Although after the rupee was linked to sterling, a bullish feeling came over business, there were not enough rupee bills to enable Government to make its remittances to London, but when the gold export set in, the exchange improved and improved so much that Government was able to purchase sterling not only for paying the maturing debt of 14 millions but to meet the whole of the Secretary of State's demands for the current financial year. The sterling bills were paid in India in rupees and this involved the expansion of currency in India to the tune of about Rs. 51 crores, during the last 4 months. Of this expansion, about 43 crores was against *ad hoc* securities, and about 8 crores against Government securities borrowed from the Imperial Bank—a device which had to be resorted to, because there was not an ample supply of inland trade bills against which emergency currency could be issued. Thus we have got expansion, and that is what the country has been loudly and persistently clamouring for. Whether the expansion has become inflation is a different matter. So far, however, hardly any alarming symptoms have come into view. The habits of the country are still so slow, and currency still moves so sluggishly, that it would take a good bit of expansion before the evil effects of it will be felt.

Thus most parties to the transaction have gained. Government has certainly gained, and Government's gain is the tax-payer's relief. The individual who has sold gold has also gained, for he has sold his gold at prices which he never had expected. It may be argued that the increased price is in inflated currency, but will any one maintain that internal prices have appreciably risen

in India ? And so long as the bulk of our needs are met by locally made goods, does it matter very much to us if the prices of imported goods have risen ? It is also argued that the present sellers might have gained more had they waited ; but seeing that the future of gold is highly uncertain, it may as well be that the sellers have gained rather than lost. Many of those who sold gold required consumable goods urgently and could not have waited ; as for the criticism that the chief gainer was the bullion merchant, is it so unusual in the Indian marketing system for the middleman to reap the greatest profit ?

Not only has the gold export helped India ; it has helped Britain as well. When the gold standard was abandoned in September, Britain was financially in dire straits owing to various causes and this was indicated by the sudden slump of the sterling. But when Indian gold came out, sterling gained an unexpected prop and soon firmed up. The result was the repayment of the credits borrowed by the Bank of England from U. S. A. and France and the lowering of the Bank rate from 6 per cent to 5 per cent. According to Walter Runciman, had it not been for the Indian gold exports, the pound might have dropped to 3 dollars, and if this had happened, disastrous consequences might have resulted from it. Thus the much-maligned Indian hoarder came to the rescue of British high finance. What if it be an involuntary gift on the part of India ? And this is not the first or the greatest of such involuntary gifts.

Nor was it only England that benefited by the Indian gold export; it has relieved the world by allaying somewhat the fear of gold shortage which is one of the chief factors in the present trade depression. India has a hoarded gold stock of at least 1,000 crores, and if the world realises that this can be drawn upon, the very psychological effect of it would be such as to allay the fear of gold shortage. *And if the rumour from America that it has been decided* to release 1,000 million dollars of gold from the Federal Reserve Board can be believed, then there are in action two forces of great potency which may be capable of lifting the trade depression. India has always absorbed a good share of the world's gold ; it may now be her turn to help the world, especially in this hour of need, and this may be tantamount to the discovery of a new gold mine and thus may solve the monetary problem of the world in so far as gold can solve it.

The Other Side.

Indeed the gold exports have converted hoarded metal into mobile purchasing power and has enabled Government to tide over troublous times, but has this country any reason to gloat over it ?

Not much. True, the gold we have exported was hoarded gold or gold in consumptive use, and did not fulfil the proper function of gold; but all the same, it is the accumulated reserve of the people and serves them well in times of need. The hoarding instinct is indeed primitive, but in a country which for long did not enjoy peace and which had no proper banking institutions, is it any wonder if people accumulated their savings in the form of gold? Normally, the peasant will not touch these reserves, but in hard times when other resources are not available, he sells his jewellery to meet his needs, even as a joint-stock company touches reserves in times of strain. Indeed it is like living on capital.

What the country has done lately is what the individual does in hard times. Normally India meets her liabilities abroad by sending goods—by a favourable balance of trade. But, as India's foreign trade has lately dwindled, this normal channel has failed and Government took advantage of gold exports to pay its dues abroad. If India had no gold hoards, this would not have been possible; thus the instinct of the Indian peasant not only helped himself in time of need, but helped his Government to make its payments abroad. Now that the need has passed away, there is no more need for leaving gold exports uncontrolled.

It has been said that gold is but a commodity, and, like other commodities, may be exported to meet the dues, but so long as gold standard is not altogether abandoned, gold is not like other commodities, especially in a country which has not got any large gold mines. Gold is not only a good store of value, but the only ultimate medium for international payments, and if India with the largest population in the world wants to adopt the gold standard, it must have a fairly large reserve of gold in its central bank. Indeed the gold in the hoards is not much of a national reserve, but when it is translated into the vaults of a central bank, it will become a veritable armament for this country.

THE STERLING STANDARD.

In this connection, one is reminded of the proposal to establish an 'empire currency' based on sterling—a proposal supported by several currency authorities and by well-known statesmen. Sir Basil Blackett, one of the leading exponents of the scheme, suggests that a 'sterling area' may be organised, which may cover not only the Empire, but other countries that have abandoned the gold standard — Scandinavia, Denmark, Japan, Egypt, and several South American States; and over this wide area both the stability of their local currencies and the stability of their mutual exchanges must be maintained by the sterling standard.

While this proposal may be a good asset for bargaining with, or even threatening, countries which have managed to get possession of more than their due share of the world's gold stock, one doubts if it would be practicable to maintain a stable purchasing power without the help of any specific commodity like gold or silver. As the *Economist* points out, under the gold standard a reduction of gold reserves would give sufficient justification to the restriction of credit, but under a sterling standard such manipulations will have to be made on the basis of index numbers and foreign trade statistics, but this is not likely to become popular and the result may be inflation and a worse mismanagement than has resulted from the gold standard. Some form of 'managed' gold standard may become necessary if the gold standard is restored and this would require international agreement; but in any such 'managed' system, gold is bound to play some part. Gold standard may be a superstition but it does not appear that the world has altogether outgrown the need for such a superstition.

At any rate, in the case of India, one cannot see how the gold standard can be scrapped. For one thing, the people in this country are, by habit and outlook, the least likely to look with favour upon any currency standard which is not based on gold or silver; and for another, who will make compensation for the terrible loss that would result if gold is demonetized? India has perhaps the largest accumulated gold stock, and its ownership is fairly widely distributed. If gold is suddenly dethroned, can it be anything short of a disaster to this country?

My own feeling is that we shall have to work our way to some form of gold standard in a carefully controlled form and preferably on a new parity. Whatever may be the nature of this new standard, India is likely to require a good gold reserve for the strength of its currency and foreign exchange. If so, we must take this opportunity to direct the flow of gold into the Government reserves, so that by the time the Reserve Bank is founded Government may have accumulated ample gold reserves. Indeed India may still require gold to meet its liabilities abroad, but this is best done by Government exporting gold, for Government could manage it more advantageously to the country than private exporters.

How can we attract our hoarded gold to our central reserve? An embargo on gold exports has been suggested. An embargo without provision for Government purchase of gold can be of no avail, but if Government offer to purchase gold at a rate notified from day to day, it may bring into the Government's coffers much gold that is now flowing out. Perhaps this policy has something to commend itself, now that the funds needed by Government in London

for the whole year have been accumulated, and especially as the establishment of the reserve bank is still the avowed objective of Government. But an embargo and the direct purchase of gold by Government at this juncture have many objectionable features. A safer method is the issue of a gold loan or gold certificates by Government as in the United States. The details of such a measure must be drawn up after taking into account the various aspects of the present situation. Indeed this may not bring into the Treasury all the gold now changing hands in the country, but may bring in enough. No doubt there are difficulties in putting this into operation, but they are not so formidable as to make a masterly inactivity the best policy.

CONCLUSION.

It is quite clear from the foregoing that the gold exports have so far been helpful in tiding over the difficulties of Government and lessening the burdens on the tax-payer ; but it does not follow that the country has gained the utmost by the opening of the hoards. Had Government issued a gold loan, part of the hoarded gold might have found its way into the Treasury and thus paved the way for the adoption of a more stable currency policy ; and, seeing that Government would only be undertaking to repay the loan in gold, the transaction might not involve a loss to Government even if in future gold were to fall in value. It is time Government reviewed the whole currency policy with a view to the adoption of a system more suited to the needs and capabilities of this country. I believe that our plentiful gold stock, if mobilised, will not only enable us to adopt a full-fledged gold standard, but will also push down the high interest rates which now depress industry and agriculture in this country. India has an immense labour force and an enviable supply of gold, and if these two potent factors have not enabled this country to increase its economic prosperity, it can only be due to inertia and lack of organisation. Thus viewed, the problem of mobilising gold is at present one of the most pivotal of our economic problems and challenges the best brains in the country.

A FEW DRAVIDIAN LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVES

BY

L. V. RAMASWAMI AYYAR, M.A., B.L.
(*Maharaja's College, Ernakulam.*)

Though the question of Dravidian origins (in its two separate aspects: linguistic and racial) yet remains shrouded in what looks like impenetrable mystery, the Dravidologue cannot miss the significance of certain recent researches which tend to prove that the Dravidian speeches were far more widespread in India than the actual location of the present-day dialects would imply. The existence of Brâhûî in the extreme North-west, of Oraon and Malto in the North-east, and of islets of Dravidian areas in Central India had already led nineteenth century scholars to adumbrate the possibility of Dravidian-speaking peoples having existed in a pre-historic past in other parts of India also. The postulate of linguistic influence exercised by Dravidian on the development of certain features of new Indo-Aryan appeared to afford some frail evidence for this possibility. Recent researches are tending to bring in fresh evidence in this direction. Prof. Przyluski of Paris who is inquiring into the pre-historic cultural elements in India has in a paper in *Journal Asiatique* (1926) observed that it is highly probable that a Dravidian stratum which extended all over India in the past was partially covered by an Austro-asiatic stratum. He is of opinion, besides, that if these Dravidian-speaking peoples had been powerful enough to overcome the Austro-asiatics they would doubtless have installed themselves or kept their ground in the rich tracts of the Indus basin and the Gangetic valley. In another paper in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 1927 (p. 354) Prof. Przyluski has made the inductive suggestion that the Dravidians 'who paid homage to their gods by watering them, adorning them with flowers, unguents and beautiful colours but never offering to them any sacrificial victims' were probably the most ancient stock of people in India and that two fresh ethnic *niveaux*—the 'Austrics' and the Aryans—were superposed one after the other on this ancient stock. Prof. Przyluski has reiterated this view (*Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. vi, p. 146 ff.) in a recent contribution also. Further evidence of a more tangible character is available now. Prof. S. K. Chatterjee of Calcutta has pointed out in his *Origin and Development of the Bengali Language* (p. 65 ff.) that a certain number of the endings of Bengali place-names like *jôla*

(*cf.* Dr. *câl*), *vîṭi* (*cf.* Dr. *vîdu*), *gaḍḍa* (*cf.* Kan. *gaḍḍe*), *pola* (*cf.* Dr. *polam* field), *kuṇḍa* (*cf.* Tel. *koṇḍa* 'hill'), *câvaṭi* (*cf.* south Dr. *câvaḍi*) point to the existence of Dravidian-speaking peoples having remained in Bengal and developed a civilization[1] of their own before the advent of the Indo-Aryans.

The problem of the racial affinities of the peoples who speak the different dialects of to-day, has to be carefully dissociated from the question of the linguistic relationships of the speeches themselves, though we shall necessarily have to envisage the bearing of the former on the latter wherever these speeches show abnormal linguistic features. The ancestors of the Brâhûîs of Baluchistan, of the Oraons and the Malers of North-east India, and of the Khonds and Gonds of Central India may or may not have been racially allied to the genuine Dravidian stock. Neither history nor 'pre-history' has as yet shed sufficient light on this matter. Even in the case of the southern Dravidian peoples, the question whether at all any ethnic type to-day may be said to represent the genuine Dravidian stock, continues to be a knotty one.

Linguistic relationships stand altogether on a different footing. An unmistakable linguistic bond, especially on the morphological side, is recognizable among the Dravidian speeches of the south and of the north. The intimacy of connection traceable among pronouns and Pronominal forms, Tense-affixes and Verbal formations, post-positional case-terminations and certain syntactical peculiarities is unequivocal proof of a common linguistic stage for these speeches. This however is not to deny the existence of certain linguistic variations which evidence the fact of differing degrees of cultural separation among the speeches. It is in the region of vocabulary, far more than in morphology, that we meet with such variations many of which have to be traced to (1) the admixture of foreign racial elements including the possibility of *substrat* in certain cases; and (2) the general linguistic influence of Indo-Aryan and Kolarian. None of these variations however are such as to preclude the postulate of a common Dravidian linguistic stage from which the various dialects of to-day should have ramified and developed peculiarities of their own, each in its own *milieu*.

Is it possible for us to reconstruct this common linguistic stage of Dravidian? The task is not an easy one in the present circumstances. We are handicapped by the absence of evidence regarding the past condition of non-southern Dravidian dialects and of any data

[1] *Cf.* also the occurrence of Dravidian-looking words in Bengali, like *muḍ* 'fold', dialectal *śapaḍ* 'to gobble up, finish off by eating', *naḍ* 'to move, walk' (page 878 of Chatterji's work). Chatterji (p. 68 *op. cit.*) also makes the interesting suggestion that the name (of the place) *tamluk* may be allied to *tamil*.

regarding the southern speeches themselves anterior to a certain limit. This total lack of evidence regarding the history of the lesser dialects, combined with the absence of a satisfactory chronology even where we have some literary materials of the past would inevitably lead to the presence of lacunæ in any present reconstruction of the common Dravidian stage.

If the reconstruction of the linguistic basis is thus bound to a certain extent to be defective, far more difficult would be the task of recasting the common cultural stage of Dravidian. How far the efflorescence of ethical and moral concepts in old Tamil represents the culmination of previous stages, we cannot say; but of one thing we can more or less be sure: that this brilliant outcrop in old Tamil literature cannot wholly have been due to the influence of Sanskrit. Seeds do not germinate on a barren soil; and even granting that seeds of Sanskrit learning were sown plentifully on Tamil soil, the richness and brilliance of the crop testify to the fertility of the soil. Be this as it may, Old Tamil culture, our knowledge of which goes back only to a certain limit, may not be relied on for giving us any satisfactory clue to that pre-historic basic stage which possibly was separated by many a century from the Tamil period of which we know.

The task of recasting the cultural past of common Dravidian is thus well-nigh an impossible task in the present circumstances. But the student who aims at reconstructing the common linguistic stage need not despair. The inter-affinities in Phonology, Morphology and Vocabulary that exist among the different dialects, major and minor, of to-day, would provide him with a starting point; and the cautious application of a combination of the analytical and the synthetic methods might enable him to take a peep into the 'linguistic' past, vague though it may be in some respects.

So far as vocabulary is concerned, the cultural separation evidenced by the word-lists available to-day, is fairly large; but there still remain important groups of words which having resisted the inroads of foreign influence, are shared in common by the dialects to-day. One such category of words is constituted of those which denote the operation of the senses, and another constituted of the names for colours. Prof. Brandstetter, that great student of Indonesian, in his monograph *Der Intellekt der indonesischen Rasse* (p. 7) tells us that 'the material of thought approaches the intellect from two sources: from the external world and from the world within. A piece of stone which rolls down a precipice driven by gravity may be as much the object of our thought as a passion welling up in our minds. The thought-stuff which proceeds from the external world is conveyed to the intellect through the activity

of the five senses, and this activity primarily evidences itself in the vocabulary of the people ; through words denoting these operations themselves and through expressions for "colours." '

The present paper aims at treating about these two types of elementary sense-words in Dravidian. What facts would a comparative examination of these words reveal about the past of Dravidian? In what degree do they appear widespread in the dialects? And wherever variations occur, what degree of cultural separation do they indicate?

These are some of the questions which the present paper would aim at discussing. The method adopted here is to classify the different words, discuss their structural and semantic contents, to indicate their distribution and inter-affinities, and finally to adumbrate views on the 'cultural' unity or separation suggested by the discussion.

[*A*] *Table of Dravidian words denoting the operations of the senses*—

...	'To see, etc.'	'To hear'	'To smell, etc.'	'To taste, etc.'	'To touch'	'To know, etc.'
5 Tamil-Mal. ...	*kâṇ-* ... *nôkk-* *pâr-* *viḻi-* *muḻi-*	*kêḷ-* ...	T. *môkk-* 'to smell' *mugar-* 'to smell' *maṇa-* *naṟu* *nâṟ-* M. *naṇṇam* 'smell' M. *nappu*. T. *kamaḻ* 'to be fragrant'	*śuv-ai* 'taste'. ... *tî-* *ten-* *kay-* *kâr-* *in-i-* *uvar-* *puḷi* } varieties of taste	*toḍ-* ... *ûṟu* 'touch'	*aṟ-i-* T. *tônd'r-* M. *tônn-* *teri-* *uḷ-* *unn-* *eṇ-*. *karud-* 'to intend, aim at, etc.' *ninai-* 'to think, know, etc.'. *puri-* 'to understand'
Kannaḍa ...	*kâṇ-* ... *nôḍ-* *pâr-* *miṭak-isu* 'to wink' *miṭi* 'blinking' 'staring'	*kêḷ-* ...	*naṟu* 'smell' 'fragrance'. *nâta* 'bad smell' *sogaḍu* 'fragrance'. *maga* 'smell'. *magmagisu* 'to smell' *kampu* 'smell'	*sî* 'sweet'. ... *kaypu* 'bitterness' *ten* *puṇi* 'sour'	*toḍ-* ...	*aṟ-i-* *tiḷi-* *uṅ-k-isu* 'to consider' *eṇ-* *nene-*
Telugu ...	*tsûḍ-* ... *kanu*, *kânu* *miḍik-intsu* 'to blink eyes'	*vinu-tsu*	*malatsu* 'to be fragrant'. *valapu* 'fragrance'. *kampu* 'smell'	*tîpu* 'sweetness'.... *cêdu* 'bitterness'. *puli* 'sour'.	*toṭṭ* ... *tāk*	*erugu-* *teli-* *en-* *tală-tsu* 'to reflect, recollect'

[*B*] *Table of Dravidian words denoting the operations of the senses*—

	'Seeing, etc.'	'Hearing'	'Smell'	'Taste'	'Touch'	'Knowing, etc.'
Tuḷu ...	*tû-* *sû-* *hû-*	*kêṇ-* 'to hear'	*mûs-p-* 'to smell' *nâd-* 'to stink' *kammana* 'scent, smell, odour' *gamas-* 'to smell, be fragrant, to stink'	*tî-pæ* 'sweetness' *kay-pæ* 'bitterness' *puli* 'sour' *ubar* 'saltish'	*muṭṭ-* 'to touch'	*pin-p-* 'to know' *teri-* 'to be clear to the mind' *eṇ-* 'to reckon'
Kûi-kûvi ...	Kûi *sûr-* 'to see' ,, *meh-p-* 'to behold' ,, *par-mb-* 'to sky' Kûvî *meh-* 'to look at' ,, *pâr-* 'to examine'	*ven-b-* 'to hear'	*mûs-k-* 'to smell'	*vaṇḍ-* 'to taste' *semb-* 'to be sweet' *lakne* 'sweet' Kûvi *kamb-* 'bitter'	Kûi *ḍig-* 'to touch'	Kûi *pun-b-* 'to know', *êlu* 'wisdom' Kûvi *punn-* 'to know' *telh-* 'to be clear to the mind'
Gôṇḍi ...	*hûr-* 'to see' *sur-* 'to look out for' *miḍ-st* 'to flesh eyes' Vizag. Koi *ûḍ-* 'to see'	*keñj-* 'to hear'	*mus-k-* *mahkar* 'sweet-smelling'	*vaṇḍi-* 'to taste' *miṅg-* 'to taste' *miṅgul* 'sweet' *keh-ka* 'bitter' *kai-tt-* 'to be bitter'	*bôṭ-* *iṭṭ-*	*puṇḍ-* 'to know'
Kurukh-Malto.	Kurukh *êr-* 'to see' 'to look at,' etc. ,, *miṭ-k-* 'to wink eyes' Malto *ṭuṇḍ-* 'to see'.	*men-* 'to hear'	Kur.-*nusuṅg-* 'to smell' kur. *ca'a-* 'to stink'	*tin-* 'to be sweet'	Kur. *emsnâ* 'to let touch' Malto *kap-* 'to touch'	Kur. *ax-* Malto *aq-* ,, *ugl-* 'to think'
Brâhûi ...	*xan-* 'to gain sight of' *hur-* } *hun-* } 'to see' *hir-* }	*bin-* } 'to *ben-* } hear'		*hanen* 'sweet' *xaren* 'bitter'		*tir-* 'to know' [stem of certain conjugations]

I. 'To See, etc.'

(*a*) *Occurrence and Meanings.*

The words given in the above list would show that the same dialect possesses structurally different forms. These forms are not semantically synonymous but strictly differentiated.

(i) *kâṇ* and its representatives everywhere signify 'to gain sight of', 'to appear', being used transitively and intransitively.

This meaning is very clearly illustrated by passages like the following from the songs of the God-intoxicated devotees of Tamil nâḍu:

Tirunâvukkarasu swâmi:

காதன் மடப்பிடியோடுங் களிறுவருவன கண்டேன்
கண்டேனவர் திருப்பாதங் கண்டறியாதன கண்டேன்

'I saw the male elephant with his beloved mate, and in that sight I saw the sacred feet of God and secrets not seen heretofore.'

தேடிக்கண்டுக் கொண்டேன் திருமாலொடு நான்முகனும்—
தேடித்தே டொணாத் தேவனை யென்னுள்ளே தேடிக்கண்டுகொண்டேன்.

'I sought and found Him in my soul,—Him whom Brahma and Viṣnu sought in vain.'

A similar usage is common in the other southern speeches, while the north-western Brâhûi *xann-* signifies the same idea of 'finding,' 'gaining sight of' in contexts like the following: *Kôr dasamusâra kare, laṭṭe tenâ xanâ* 'the blind man groped and found his crutches.'

(ii) Tamil *nôkk* (found in the literary dialect only and not in the colloquial), Kannaḍa *nôḍ-* (common to the old and the new dialects alike) and Malayâḷam *nôkk* mean 'to look at', 'to consider.' Malayâḷam *nôkk-* is a common everyday form to-day, implying distinctly a great deal more than *kâṇ-*: cf. the Malayâḷam usage in phrases like *nâḍugaḷ kâṇuga* 'to visit lands,' *varavu nôkkuga* 'to await arrival', *peṇṇu nôkkuga* 'to search for a wife', etc.

(iii) Modern Tamil uses *pâr-* to denote the idea, Malayâḷam *nôkk-*, Kannaḍa *nôḍ-*. This word is also found in Old Kannaḍa and Old Tamil where the meaning apparently was more intensive ('to examine, investigate') than is implied in the modern usage of the word, which is more or less equivalent to that of Kannaḍa *nôḍ-* and Malayâḷam *nôkk-*.

(iv) Tamil *viḻi-* and colloquial *muḻi-* literally mean 'to wink', 'to open the eyes'. *viḻi-* with this meaning is found in old Tamil texts, cf. Śilappadigâram, canto X, nâḍukâṅgâdai, l. 1, *vâṅgaṇ viḻiyâ vaigaṛayâmattu*, Tiruvalluvar's உறங்கி விழிப்பதுபோலும் பிறப்பு, Mâṇik-

kavâśagar's *naṭṭârgaḷ viḷittiruppa ñâlattuḷḷe.* This form is found among the southern dialects ; it has cognates in the central Dravidian Kûi and north Dravidian Kuru<u>kh</u>.

(v) Telugu *tsûḍ*-to-day has all the force and meaning of modern Tamil *pâr*-, Kannaḍa *nôḍ*-, Malayâḷam *nôkk*-, but it appears to have to a certain extent invaded the region of *kâṇ*- also : cf. *nênu idivaragu âyananu tsûḍalêdu* 'I have not seen him so far.'

(vi) Tuḷu conveys the ideas of 'finding' and 'looking at' or 'observing' by *tû*- and its sub-dialectal varieties *sû*- and *hû*. Tuḷu has no other words to express the idea of 'seeing' or 'looking at'.

(vii) Kûi has two words differentiated semantically : *sûr*- 'to see,' 'to gain sight of,' and *meh*- 'to look at', 'to behold'. *cf. irariki deraru ini surîdî* 'thou shalt find a greater one than these', *evi meh-k-atu* 'they went and observed.'

(viii) Gôṇḍi has *hur*- 'to see' while *sur*- means 'to look out for': *huṛkat ! bah raj takstatol ! Ona raj ol huṛi.* let us see what sort of a king he'll make ! Let him look to his kingdom.'

(ix) Kuru<u>kh</u> *êr*- expresses both the ideas of 'seeing' and 'looking at' in expressions like the following: *ortosin îrâge kânâ* 'to go to visit one', *pên êrnâ* 'to search for lice'. *êr*- is used as a constituent of compound verbs with the nuance 'to try to' *e.g., oṇṭâ mannan arg êrnâ* 'to try to climb a tree'—*cf.* Tamil *marattil êri parka.*

(x) Brahui *hûr*- is carefully distinguished semantically from *xan*- 'to gain sight of,' as *hûr*- always signifies 'to look at, observe, consider.' *e.g., barak va hurak !* 'Come and observe !'

xan- on the other hand, siginfies 'to gain sight of' as in the south, *e.g., dafteau ni bhalo girate xanos* 'thou shalt see greater things than these.'

(xi) Malto *gotror ṭuṇḍner* 'the blind shall see' would illustrate the meaning of *ṭuṇḍ*- 'to gain sight of'; while *êr*- 'to observe' is found in *ante ning Dangaleki qanuo kodîth â tîkle indrik erne* 'why observest thou the mote in thy brother's eye ?'

(*b*) *Classification and analytical comparison of forms.*

Six main types are distinguishable on the basis of structure and meanings :—

Group (i) Tuḷu *tû*-, *sû*-, *hû*-.
Telugu *tsûḍ*-
Kûi *sûr*-
Gôṇḍi *hûṛ*-
,, *sûr*-
Vizag. Koi *ûḍ*- 'to see' [<(*h*) *ûḍ*]
Brâhûî *hûr*-
Malto *ṭuṇḍ*-

I have discussed these forms and their cognates elsewhere[1] and tried to show that they may all be traceable to a primary base* *tū̆-* from which a host of forms have been derived in the different dialects. The words for 'fire', 'light', 'visibility', 'appearance', and 'sight' are inter-related in many language-families, and here in this group we have an instance of a set of Dravidian forms illustrative of this inter-relationship.

The formative morphemes and the change of original *t-* to *s-* in some cases and to *h-* in others have been discussed by me elsewhere.[1]

It is noteworthy that though Tamil and Kannaḍa do not show connected forms with the meaning 'to see', 'to look at', these dialects do possess numerous words with cognate semantic contents, basically related to this set.

The relationship of this set to Kuru<u>kh</u> *êr-*, Malto *êr* 'to see, observe etc.', Kûi *êr-* 'to spy', Brâhûi *hir-* 'to see' (not adduced by Sir Denys Bray but given by Trumpp) is not clear.

For the significance of the widespread distribution of this set of forms, see below.

(Group ii) Tamil *kâṇ-*
Mal. *kâṇ-*
Kannaḍa *kâṇ*
Koḍagu *kâṇ-*
Tôḍa *kôṇ-*
Brâhûi *xan-*
Cf. Kuru<u>kh</u> *xannâ*[2]

This set is obviously related to common Dravidian *kaṇ* (eye) found in all the dialects including Kûi and Gôṇḍi where *kâṇ-* with the meaning 'to see' does not occur.

Group (iii) Tamil *nôkk-*
Mal. *nôkk-*
Kannaḍa *nôḷ-*, *nôḻ-*, *nôḍ-*.
Tôḍa *nôḍ-*
Cf. Kûvi *nôkita* 'in front of.'

This group appears to be restricted to the south. Even in the south, Telugu does not show any connected word. Kûvi *nôkita* may possibily be a borrowing from the south. The limited distribution of this group is significant.

Group (iv)
Tamil *pâr-*

[1] *Calcutta University Journal of Letters*, vol. xix.
[2] *xan* of Kuru<u>kh</u> does not mean 'to gain sight of', which function is performed by *êr*, but 'to be pleasant to the eye' *e.g.*, *xēsô kicrî engage mal xanô* 'a red garment does not suit me well'.

Group (iv)

Old Mal.	*pâr-* 'to observe, etc'. Modern Mal. *pâr-k-* 'to live, abide'.
Old Kannaḍa	*pâr-*
Kûvi	*pâr-*
Kûi	*por-p-* 'to spy', 'to watch'.
,,	*pâr-mb-* 'to grope'.

This set appears to be confined to the south and to Kûi-Kûvi Telugu has no connected word with the meaning 'to examine' but it has *pâṛuva*, 'seer' 'brahmin' with which Kannaḍa *pâruva*, *hâruva*, and Tamil *pâr-p-ân* [1] are connected. The base *pâr-* has been suggested by Gundert to be an ancient *tadbhava* from Sanskrit *par* which according to him directly gave rise to Tamil *pâr* 'earth' from which the verb *pâr-* with the meanings 'to behold', 'to observe' and the other meanings 'to live', 'abide' (current in modern Malayâḷam) have been derived; Gundert in support of his suggestion, suggests the analogy of Sanskrit *loka* and *locana*.

Group (v)

	Tamil	*viḻi-*, colloquial *muḻi-*, *miḻi-*
	Mal.	*viḻi-kk-*
	Tel.	*miḍik-intsu* 'to blink'.
	Kann.	*miṭak-isu* 'to wink'.
	,,	*miṭi* 'blinking'.
Cf.	,,	*miki miki nôḍ-* 'to look with a blink or stare'.
	Kûvi	*meh-* 'to see'.
	Kûi	*meh-p-* 'to observe', 'to look at'.
	Gôṇḍi	*miḍ-st-* 'to open eyes', 'to flash a look'.
	Kurukh	*miṭ-k-* 'to wink eyes'.

It is not impossible to suggest a structural inter-connection among these forms on a Dravidic basis. The change of initial *v-* to *m-* is attested by analogies [2] in the southern dialects. The continuative *-ḻ-* of Tamil-Mal. and Old Kannaḍa may stand for an older cacuminal *-ḷ-*. *viḻi-*, *muḻi-* of Tamil-Mal. are *kâritas* incorporating the reinforcing affix *k* (*k*)- in certain tense-forms; if we postulate an older *-ḷ-* for the present *-ḻ-* of Tam.- Mal., this *-ḷ-* when in the immediate proximity of the affix *-k* (*k*) would, according to sandhi-rules mirrored now in Tamil, change to *-ṭ-* or *-ḍ-* and this might explain the cacuminals of the Gôṇḍi and Kurukh forms. As for the *-h-* of the Kûi- Kûvi form, the analogy of Kûi words like *kah-p-* 'to play' (*cf.* southern *kaḷi* 'to play') may be adduced to support the postulate of an older *-ḷ-*. *-p-* of

[1] Tamil *pârpân* has been explained by some as a *tadbhava* of Sanskrit *brâhmaṇa* or as a Prakrit-derived adaptation of the same word.

[2] 'Dravidian Notes', *IHQ*, 1929, 340.

Kûi is a characteristic *new* formative of Kûi, while -(*s*)*t*- of Gôṇḍi is the causative affix.

If then these forms are structurally allied, the basic signification was probably 'to cause eyes to shine', 'to wink' found in Tam., Mal., Gôṇḍi and Kurukh. Kûvi has extended and generalised the meaning to the idea of 'seeing', 'looking at', as our illustrations given above would show. Kûi has on the other hand transferred and restricted the meaning to 'observing', the general idea of 'seeing' being denoted in this dialect by *sur-*.

What factors were responsible for the importance which *meh-* attained in Kûi and Kûvi? While the other dialects retain the probably older meaning 'to wink', 'to open eyes', why should the central Indian Kûi- Kûvi have made the form assume the function of southern *nôḍ-*, *pâr-* on the one hand and of *kâṇ-* on the other? I venture to suggest that the existence of certain Kolarian words for 'eye' like *mat*, *met*, *meh* in the neighbouring Indian Austric dialects may have had something to do with the semantic transformation of Kûi- Kûvi *meh-*

(*c*) *Distribution of the groups.*

(Group i)	(Gr. ii)	(Gr. iii)	(Gr. iv)	(Gr. v)
Tuḷu	Tam.	Tam.	Tam.	Tam
Tel.	Mal.	Mal.	Mal.	Mal.
Kûi	Kan.	Kannaḍa	Kan.	Kann.
Gôṇḍi	Tel.		Kûi	Tel.
Malto	Tuḷu		Kûvi	Kûi
Brâhûi	Brâhûi			Kûvi
				Gôṇḍi
				Kurukh.

The following points are noteworthy :—

(*a*) Groups (i), (ii) and (v) appear to be the most widespread. It may be noted that Tamil and Kannaḍå which do not show representatives in Group (i) with the meaning 'to see' or 'to observe', do have a large number of cognates with other meanings basically related to this group.

(*b*) Group (ii) is represented in every dialect except Kûi and Gôṇḍi of Central India and Kurukh of the north; but these latter dialects do possess the basal *kan* 'eye' represented in them.

(*c*) Group (iii) is confined to the south and is probably a special development there. It is significant that Telugu alone in the south fails to evidence a representative for this group of the south.

(*d*) Group (iv) appears in the south and in Central Dravidian. The most ancient Tamil texts evidence the antiquity of this group;

nevertheless, the question of the base being an ancient adaptation from Sanskrit remains to be investigated.

So far as the semantic constituents of the different groups are concerned, the following may be singled out :—

(1) The meaning of Group (ii) is fundamentally distinctive everywhere, while that of Group (i) varies between 'gaining sight of' or 'seeing' on the one hand, and 'looking at' or 'observing' on the other.

(2) In Old Tamil and Old Kannaḍa where representatives of Groups (iii) and (iv) are found together, slightly differing nuances distinguish their meanings.

(3) Kûi and Kûvi have varied the original signification of Group (v), probably under the influence of structurally analogous Kolarian words of the neighbouring districts.

II. 'To Hear'

(a) *Occurrence and meanings.*

(i) *Kêḷ-* is used transitively as well as intransitively in all the southern dialects: *cf.* for the latter Tamil *aḍu enakkụ kêḷkkavillai*, Kannaḍa *adu nanage kêluvadilla* 'that to me is not heard.' Gôṇḍi also shows a similar intransitive usage in expressions like *nî prârdana kenjikatte* 'thy prayer is heard.'

(ii) By a process of Perissemic Irradiation of meaning, *kêḷ-* of the south has come to mean 'to ask' also in all the southern dialects. An exactly similar semantic change appears to have occurred in connection with Kûi *ven-* and Kuru<u>kh</u> *men-* which primarily mean 'to hear': *cf.* Kuru<u>kh</u> *meñj êr* 'to ask entreatingly,' Malto '*iθ indrθ ?*' *any menjah* 'he asked "what is this?"', Kûi *nângi venumu* 'ask (thou) me!' etc.

It is worthy of mention in this connection that while Malto has *men-* to signify 'hearing', 'asking', it has *qeg-*(allied to *kêḷ-kk* of the south) to denote the idea of 'asking' e.g., *nin qegni aθe en ciyen* 'what thou askest for, I shall give.' This fact would apparently imply the existence of a lost meaning 'to hear' for *qeg* of Malto. Similarly Kûi *kel-p-* 'to invoke the deity' may be allied to *kêḷ-* of the south.

(iii) It is remarkable that those dialects which do not show *kêḷ-* or connected forms for 'hearing' show the alternative group formed of *vin-*, *ven-*, *bin-* and *men-* to denote 'hearing.'

(b) *Classification and analysis of forms.*

Group (i).

Tamil. *kêḷ.*

Mal. *kêḷ.*

Group (i)

Kann. *kêḷ.*
Tuḷu. *kêṇ.*
Koḍagu. *kêḷ.*
Tôda. *kêḷ-; cf. kêḷvan* 'word'.
Gôṇdi. *keñj.*

Cf. Kûi *kel-p-* 'to invoke'.
Cf. Malto *qeg-* 'to ask'.

Barring the change of medial *-ḷ-* to *-ṇ-* in Tuḷu (for which compare *vêḷ-, vêṇ,* etc. of the south) and to *ñj* in Gôṇḍi, the words reveal a striking structural identity.

Group (ii).

Tel. *vinu-tsu-*
Kûi *ven-b-*
Kûvi *ven-*
Brâhûi *bin-, ben-*
Kurukh *men-*
Malto *men-*

We have observed already how just those dialects which do not have representatives of Group (i) show forms of Group (ii). This does not mean that some of the conservative dialects of the south, particularly Tamil, do not have cognates for Group (ii) with *other* meanings. Tam. *vinai,* Mal. *vina* (and *mena* in *mena-kkêḍu* 'enforced absence of work') meaning 'earnest action, work' and old Tamil *vinav-* 'to ask' appear to have a basal relationship to this series.[1]

The structural variations of the members of this group are all normal. The alternation of *v-* and *b-* according as the particular dialects favours [2] the one or the other, and the change of *b-* to *m-* [1] in Kurukh and Malto (under the influence of the already existing nasal in the words) are all normal.

Of other forms in the dialects not connected with either of the above groups, we may mention here the very interesting Tôḍa word *ûr-* 'to listen to' in contexts like *ûriṭṭvôy ôḷ* 'the man who listens.' This word, I think, is related to Tamil *ôr-k* 'to listen', 'to consider,' Kannaḍa *ôr-* 'to search,' Tel. *ôr-* 'to suffer,' *orimi* 'patience,' Mal. *ôr-k* 'to remember', *ôrma* 'memory'. Comparing all these semantic ramifications, one might postulate the basic signification as 'to apply oneself to', 'to be attached to', from which concrete

[1] If two or more basically different words develop in the history of a language synonymous meanings, the tendency to popularise one form to the exclusion of the others with the same meaning, may result in the suppression, in that language, of the less popular forms. For IE, see Hirt's *IGc. Grammatik,* I, §. 160.

[2] 'Initial Bilabials of Dravidian,' *ER,* February, 1931.

sense-idea the other meanings have been developed by the processes of Metecsemy and Perissemy.

III. 'To Taste'

It may be noted preliminarily that there are very few native words to express the generalised idea of 'tasting', though the concrete conceptions of 'sweetness', 'bitterness', etc. are denoted by allied words common to many dialects. A list of the actual forms for the generic idea in the different dialects would illustrate how each dialect or group of dialects has evolved independent forms of its own :—

Tam.-Mal. *śuvai*, *cuva* 'taste'.
Kann. *savi* 'taste'.
Tel. *tsavi* 'taste'.
Kûi *vaṇḍ-* 'to taste'.
Gôṇḍi *vaṇḍi-* 'to taste'.
Kûvi *sempu hena* 'to be sweet' > 'to taste'.
Tôḍa *bai kôṇ-* 'to see through the mouth' > 'to taste'.
Brâhûi *cakk-* 'to taste'—a loan-word from Ṣina.

Of these, the Telugu, Tuḷu and Kannaḍa words are probably ancient *tadbhavas* of Sanskrit *svâd* 'taste', and Mal. *cava* 'taste', 'peculiar taste' may be related. Gundert's suggestion that all these forms may have been derived from Indo-âryan *carvana* 'chewing' is, I think, less plausible in view of the meaning. Mal. *cava-kk* 'to chew' which in certain contents has exercised contamination on *cuva* 'taste' may be related to this *carvana*, but the words under reference for 'taste' I think are allied to Indo-âryan *svâd.*

The Kûi and the Gôṇḍi forms may be connected with *vây* 'mouth' even as Tôḍa has evolved the idea of 'tasting' from 'mouth'.

Among the specific tastes, while the southern dialects distinguish a large number, the central and the northern speeches conspicuously show only words for 'sweetness' and 'bitterness'.

Sûtra 454 of Uri-iyal of Nannûl marks off *îṉippu* 'sweetness', *kaippu* 'bitterness', *puḷippu* 'sourness', *kârpu* 'astringency' and *uvarpu* 'saltish taste'. Most of these words are represented in the other southern dialects, while the northern and central speeches show related forms only for 'sweetness', 'bitterness' and in a few cases for 'sourness'.

Group (i) 'Sweet'—

Tamil *tî- cf. ten-* 'sweet' and *têṉ* 'honey'.
Mal. *tî–*
Tel. *tîpu*
Kann. *sî*

Group (i) SWEET—

Tuḷu *tîpæ, sî-pæ, hî-pæ*
Kûi *sem-b-* ' to be sweet '.
Kûvi *hem-pu* ' sweetness '.
Kurukh *tin–* ' to be sweet '.

This is a very ancient group, attested in the oldest extant texts of the south. The structural variations are all normal: the sub-dialectal *s–* and *h–* of Tuḷu < *t–*; Kûi *s–* <*t–* (*vide* my ' Dravidian Initial Affricates and Fricatives ' in *Indian Antiquary;* and my ' Initial Tuḷu Sibilants ' in *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society,* October 1931)

Group (ii) ' SWEET '—

Tamil *in-iya* ' sweet ', *inimai* ' sweetness '.
Mal. *in-iya*
Kann. *im-pu* ' agreeableness, sweetness '.
Telugu *ilimi* ' agreeableness '.
Tuḷu *impu*
Brâhûi *han-en* ' sweet '.

The basal form is *in–* ' agreeable ' and is directly recognizable in the southern words. If Brâhûi *han-en* is not allied to Gr. (i), Brâhûi *h–* may be prothetic as in Brâhûi *hal* ' mouse ' beside Gôṇḍi *all-i* and southern *eli, ili* ' mouse ', Br. *huṛ–* ' to suck ' beside southern *uṛ-i-*, Br. *hêṭ* ' sheep ' beside Tuḷu *êḍu* and Tamil *âḍu,* Br. *het–* ' to raise ' beside southern *êr–* ' to rise ' [Br.–*f–* is the causative affix corresponding to *–v–* of the south], etc.

Other words in the dialects for ' sweet ' not belonging to either of the two above groups are the following :—

Kûi *nak–* ' to be sweet ' } connected with Kûi *nâk–* 'to lick,'
Kûvi *lak-ne* ' sweet ' } southern *nakk–* ' to lick '.

Gôṇḍi *mingul* ' to sweet ' }
,, *miṅg–* ' to be tasty' }–allied to Telugu *miṅg–*, *mriṅg–* ' to swallow ', Tam.–Mal. *viḻuṅg, muḻuṅg* ' to swallow '; the semantic change apparently was one of transference of meaning: ' to be swallowable ' > ' to be tasty ' > ' to be sweet.'

Group (iii) ' BITTER '—

Tam. *kay–*, colloquial *kaśa–*
Mal. *kay*
Kann. *kaypu* ' bitterness '
Tel. *cêdu* ' bitterness '.
Tuḷu *kay-pæ*
Kûvi *kamb-eli* ' bitterness '.
,, *ka-p-ne* ' bitter '.
Gôṇḍi *kay-tt–* ' to be bitter '.
,, *keh-ke* ' bitter '.

Telugu *c–* is the result of palatalisation induced by the following front vowel.

Group (iv)—

Tam. *kâr–* 'to be astringent'.
Kann. *kâra* 'pungency, hotness of taste', *kasar* 'astringent'.
Tel. *karu* 'saltish'.
Gôṇdi *kar-ust–* 'to be tasty' <* 'to be saltish'.
Brâhûi *xâr-en* 'bitter'.
Kurukh *xaḍ-xâ* 'bitter'– probably directly connected with NIA forms.

These forms with slightly varying meanings may be developments of an ancient adaptation from IA *kṣâra.* The antiquity of the Dravidian words is testified to by their distribution and by *x–* (< older *k–*) of the Brâhûi and Kurukh words. The variations in the meanings have nothing abnormal about them.

Group (v)—

Tamil *uvar-pu* 'saltish taste'.
Mal. *uvar–*, *ôr–* 'saltish'.
Kann. *ogar–* 'saltish'.
Tel. *ogar–* 'saltish'.
Tuḷu *ubar–* 'saltish'.

An exclusively southern group, this appears to be related to *uppu* 'salt' found in all the southern dialects.

Group (vi) 'Sour'—

Tam. *puḷi*
Mal. *puḷi*
Kann. *puḷi*
Tel. *puḷi*
Tuḷu *puḷi*, *puli*
Kûvi *pulla* (a borrowing from the neighbouring Telugu).

This group again is confined to the south.

The native words for 'sweet' and 'bitter' are more widespread than those for the other 'tastes.'

IV. 'To Smell'

(*a*) Here again, the dialects appear to have developed independent forms for the generic idea :

Tamil *maṇa-* 'to have a good smell' > 'to smell'.
Mal. *maṇa-* 'to smell', *naṅnam*, *nappu* 'smell.'
Kann. *maga* 'smell'.
Telugu *valavu* 'fragrance'.
Tuḷu *mûs-p-* 'to smell'.
Kûi *mus-k-* 'to smell'.
Gôṇdi *mûñj-*

Tôḍa *miṭṭuf kôṇ-* 'to see through the nose' > 'to smell'.
Kûvi *gando muñj-* 'to smell'.

(i) Tam.–Mal. *maṇam* with its original meaning (current now also) 'good smell' is probably connected with the second constituent of Sanskrit *pari-maḷa* 'exquisitely fragrant.' In the old Mal. text Ramacaritam, *parimaḷa* appears as *parimaṇam âḷum mâleyam* 'the sandal tree that emits exquisite fragrance'.

(ii) Kannada *maga* 'smell' and *magmagisu* 'to be fragrant' are probably imitative in origin. *Cf.* Kuru*kh* *mah-mah-r-nâ* 'to be fragrant'.

Old Kannada *sogaḍa* 'sharp smell' appears to be like a *tadbhava* of *sugandha*, while Kannada *sausava* 'fragrance, smell' reminds us of Sanskrit *saurabhya*. Telugu *valavu* 'smell, fragrance' is allied to Kannada *olavu*, *olime* 'agreeableness.'

(iii) There is another Kannaḍa word *kampu* which means 'smell' in the older dialect while the modern meaning is 'agreeable smell'. I do not know how far it is correct to connect (as Kittel does) this word and its Telugu cognate *kampu* older 'smell', modern 'stink' with Mal. *kendu-* 'to stink' which is obviously an adaptation of IA *gandha*.

All the following forms appear to be related to this series :

Tam.	*kamaḻ-* 'to be fragrant'– found in the oldest texts.
Mysore Kann.	*gamaṇa*, *gamana* 'odour, fragrance'.
Kann.	*kammu* 'smell'.
,,	*gampu* 'fragrance', *gama* 'strong fragrance'.
Tel.	*kammana*, *kammu* 'fragrance'.
Tulu	*gama-su* 'to smell sweet, stink'.
,,	*kammana* 'smell, scent, stink'.

(iv) The words in Tuḷu, Kûi, Kuru*kh* [1] and Gôṇḍi are traceable to a Dravidian base *muy-* 'front, face, nose etc.' on which other words have been formed in Dravidian. Whether Tam. *mugar-*, *mugakk-*, *môkk-* 'to smell' are connected with this series or whether they are derived from Sanskrit *mukha* 'face' is not clear.

(*q*) There is a group of southern words formed on a *naṟ-* basis :—

Tam. *naṟu* 'fragrant', *nâṟ-*
Mal. *naṟu* 'fragrant', *nâṟ-* 'to stink',
nannam, *nappu* 'smell'.
Old Kannaḍa *naṟu* 'fragrant', *nâta* 'bad smell'.
Tuḷu *nâṭa* 'bad smell.'
Tulu *nâd-* 'to stink.'

[1] The initial *n-* of Kuru*kh* *nusung-* 'to smell' beside Tuḷu *muñj-*, Gôṇḍi *mus-k-*, does not create any difficulty, since *n-* initially in Kuru*kh* sometimes stands for *m-*, as in *nubb* 'three' beside *mubb-*; *cf.* a similar *n-* for *m-* in Tuḷu *nuṅg* 'to swallow' beside Telugu *ming-*, etc.

The original basic meaning 'fragrant' appears in the primary form *naṛu* of Tamil. *naṛ* is probably traceable still further back to *nal* + *t*, on the analogy of words with *-ṛ-* like Tamil *kôṛ-* < *kôl-* + *t-*. This derivation is confirmed by Mal. *nann-am* < *nand'r-* < *nal* + *d-*, and by Mal. *nappu* < *nat'pu* < *nal* + *p-*

The derivatives *nâṛ-* 'to stink,' *nâta* 'bad smell', *nâṭa* 'stink' have become pejorative in meaning. In the earliest stages of Tamil, this pejorative meaning had not yet cropped up, though *nât' t' ram* was employed as a *vox media* to mean *naṛu-nât' t' ram* 'good smell' and *tî-nât' t' ram* 'bad smell' alike. How did it happen that in later stages the words underwent pejoration? One of those ideas which easily lend themselves to pejoration is that of 'smell, fragrance,' especially when new words denoting 'fragrance' become sufficiently popular in the language to replace in common parlance the older forms. I think that we have to trace the pejoration of the Dravidian forms to the invasion by the comparatively later *maṉam* 'fragrance,' of the province of *nâṛ-* which thereupon acquired a degradation of meaning in popular associations. Significantly enough, this *maṉam* is in certain sub-dialects of Malayâlam now going the way of older *nâṛ-* and has itself become pejorative in meaning, yielding place to words like *vâsana* (Sanskrit) which in these sub-dialects always does duty for the older meaning of *maṉam*. *Cf.* here the pejoration of Mal. *kend-* 'to stink' with Skt. *gandha*. Carnoy in his work *La Science du Mot* (page 196) gives an exactly parallel instance: 'German *stinken* signified formerly "to smell" in general. When German *riechen* (Dutch *rieken*) connected with German *rauch* (Dutch *rook*) which denoted "incense-smoke" came to mean by transference the "perfumes" which these vapours exhale, *stinken* by opposition had to be restricted to the meaning "disagreeable odour". And to-day *riechen* itself in its turn, owing to the intrusion of *duften*, has come to be used for "bad odour".'

V. 'To Touch'

Group (i) Tam. *toḍ-* 'to touch'; *ûṛu* 'touch' < *uṛ-* 'to remain', 'to be in contact with'.
Mal. *toḍ-*
Kann. *toḍ-*
Tôda *toḍr-*
Tel. *toṭṭ-*

This group is found in the south only.

Group (ii) Tuḷu *muṭṭ—*
Tel. *muṭṭ—*, beside *tāk* and *toṭṭ—*
Koḍagu *muṭṭ—* 'to touch'.

muṭṭ—in Tamil, Mal. and Kannaḍa means 'to strike, come in contact with some force.'

VI. 'To Know, etc.'

The ideas of 'feeling in the mind', 'knowing', 'understanding' are in many languages denoted by words derived through Irradiation from bases expressing concrete meanings and sense-perceptions. The Dravidian words given below are all illustrative of this phenomenon.

It is noteworthy that the widespread character of some of the groups given below significantly points to a fairly early development of the ideas of 'knowing' and 'feeling' from concrete conceptions.

The semantic nuances distinguishing the groups are recognizable: *aṛi-, etc.* (group i) signify 'knowing'; *tônd'r-. etc.* (group ii) denote 'appearing to the mind'; *teri, etc.* (group iii) mean 'to become clear to the mind'; *uḷ-, etc.* (group v) refer to 'supposing, thinking'; and *puri-, etc.* emphasise the idea of 'understanding'. It will be found that each of these nuances is the direct outcome of the primary semantic component of the base concerned.

Group. (i) Tam. *aṛi-*
Mal. *aṛi-*
Kann. *aṛi-*
Tulu *ari-*
Tel. *er-ugu-*
Tôḍa *oṛi-, ori-*
? Kuru<u>kh</u> *ax-*
? Malto *ax-*

aṛ-i, etc. appear to be connected with Tamil-Kanaḍa *aṛ-am* 'knowledge', *etc.* The base probably was *aṛ-* 'to cut', 'to divide', 'to distinguish', the idea of 'knowing' having been considered as a unique manifestation of the analytical faculty of distinguishing and discriminating.

As far the structural peculiarities of the forms above, Tôḍa *o-* for *a-*, Tel. *e-* for *a-* are normal. If Kuru<u>kh</u>-Malto *-x-* stands for older *-rg-* where *-g* is a reinforcer (as in Kuru<u>kh</u> *aṛg-* 'to climb' beside southern *êr-*, etc.), the words of Kuru<u>kh</u> and Malto may be related to this group; Grignard, however regards them as adapted from Persian (*via* Urdu) *axun* 'teacher'.

Group (ii) Tam. *tônḍr-, tot't'r-*
Kann. *tôṛ-*
Tel. *tsôp-*
Mal. *tônn-*

Tulu *tôj-*

Cf. Kûi *tôñj-* and Toda *tûr-* which are used only literally.

The southern dialects employ the words to-day only with the signification 'to appear *to the mind*' though Old Tamil and Old Kannaḍa texts generally evidence the literal application.

I have discussed elsewhere[1] the structural aspects of this group and its basic relationship to other words of Dravidian.

Group (iii) Tam. *ter-i-*
Mal. *ter-i-*, *tir-i-*
Kann. *tiḷ-i-*
Tel. *tel-i-*
Kûvi, *telh-i-*
Brâhûi stem *tir-*

All the southern words to-day have the literal signification and the perissemic growth alike ; but Brâhûi negative stem *tir-* does not have the former.

Group (iv) Tam. colloquial *puri-* 'to understand'.[2]
Gôṇḍi *puṇḍ-* 'to know'.
Kûi *puṇb-* 'to know'.
Kûvi *hunn-* 'to know'.
Tulu *pin-p-* 'to know'.

Cf. Old Kannaḍa *pump*—'to intend'.

The basic semantic dominant appears to be 'to enter deep (mentally) into a thing'. In the southern speeches we have *pûḍ-*, *pûṇ-* 'to unite firmly' to which the members of this group may be structurally and semantically allied ; but the relationship of Tamil *-r-* to the corresponding finals of the bases of other dialects is not quite clear ; but Tam. *porund-* 'to agree', *pul-* 'to unite', Kann. *pore* 'to be joined', would show that the Tamil word may be basically allied to this series.

Group (v) Tamil *uḷ-* 'to think', *uṇ-* 'to consider'.
Mal. *uḷ-*, *unn-*
Kann. *uṅ-k-isu-* 'to consider'.
Tôda. *un-* 'to suppose, think'.
Baḍaga *un-*
Kôṭa *un-*

All these forms are connected with, or traceable ultimately to, the elementary Dravidic base *uḷ* 'inside' which, as I have shown elsewere,[3] has given rise to numerous forms in the dialects.

[1] *Calcutta University Journal*, vol. xix.

[2] This meaning is not found in the Sangam texts where the significations for this word are 'to wish,' 'to make,' etc. *cf.* verses 35 and 145 of Puṟanânûṟu.

[3] Dravidian base *uḷ*, *Bulletin of Linguistic Society of India*, vol. i

There is a Malto verb *ugl-* with the meaning 'to suppose, think' used in contexts like the following :—

ên qêqlno malerin birgtrote barcken any ugleyoma 'do not suppose that I am com eto send peace on earth'. It is possible that this word is related to this group, though its structure remains to be explained with reference to *uḷ-*

Group (vi) Tamil. *eṇ-* 'to reckon', 'to think'.
Mal. *eṇ-*
Kann. *eṇ-*
Tel. *en-*
Tuḷu *eṇ-*
Kûi. *el-ki-* 'thought'.
,, *êlu-* 'thought, mind, reason, understanding'.
Brâhûi *hêḷ-* 'knowledge, wisdom'.

The original primary meaning is retained in the southern dialects side by side with metecsemic development 'to think'. The process of change apparently has been 'to count' > 'to reckon' > 'to mark off (mentally) into categories' > 'to think, etc.'

Both Kûi and Brâhûi show only the noun forms. Kûi has *el-ki* (with which we may directly compare Tamil *eṇṇi-kkai*, Kannaḍa *eṇṇike*) beside *êlu* with the long vowel. This word with the alveolar lateral cannot be said to be connected with southern *êl-* 'to receive' for which Kûi has a cognate *ên-* 'to accept, receive'.

h- of the Brâhûi word is prothetic as in Brâhûi *he-ṭ-* 'to raise', beside *êr-* of the south, *hîn-* 'to lamb' beside *în* of the south.

The presence of *-l* in Kûi and of *-ḷ-* in Brâhûi would raise the question whether *-ṇ-* of the southern forms may not be secondary; especially when we know that *-ṇ-* in similar positions in the southern speeches (*cf.* Tam. *uṇ-* 'to eat' beside *uḷ-* 'inside', *vêṇ-* 'to desire' beside *vêḷ-*, etc.) is secondary; but for this particular instance, unequivocal proof in the shape of cognates with -ḷ- is not available.

The forms Tam. *ninai* and Kann. *nene* 'to think', are allied to Tam. *neñju* 'mind, heart' and to Kûi *nêñja* 'to breathe'.

What perhaps is the most striking feature of our discussion of Dravidian words for 'knowing, understanding, thinking, etc.' is that the southern speeches particularly Tamil, not only possess representatives of every group but retain even to-day in most cases the primary literal meanings side by side with the metecsemic developments.

[*B*] *Table of Dravidian Words denoting colours*—

	'White'	'Red'	'Black'	'Green'	'Yellow'	'Colour'
Tamil-Mal. ...	*veḷ-, veṇ-,* *vāl*	*šem-,šev-,šey* Mal. *cem-,cev-,cov-* T. *tuvar* 'red'.	*kar-, kaṛ-*	*pay-, pašu-,pacca-*	*mañjaḷ*	*keḷu, kēḷ.* *niṛam*
Telugu ...	*vella* *tella*	*ceṅ-.* *errani* *togar* 'red'.	*kaṛṛi* *nallani.*	*pasuru* *ākkupacca*	*pasupupacca* *pasume*	IA
Kannaḍa ...	*biḷ*	*kem-, kes-*	*kaṛu, kandu,* *kappe*	*pasi*	*mañjal*	IA
Tuḷu ...	*boḷ*	*kem-*	*kajæ, kappe*	*pajæ*	*mañjal*	IA
Kûi-Kûvi ...	Kûvi *veḷḷa* *cf.* Kûi *tiri* 'clear'	Kûvi *lôngi* ,, *kad-*	Kui *gand-ari* Kûvi *kâd-* Kûi *gri-p-* 'to be burnt black'	Kûvi *hi'i-*	IA	IA
Gôṇḍi ...	IA	IA	*kaṛ (ḍ) ial* 'black', beside IA *kâli*	IA	*kamkal* 'turmeric yellow'	IA
Kurukh-Malto ...	*billî* M. *biḍyû* 'bright'	Kur. *xēsô* Malto *qesô*	*môxârô* Malto *marg*	...	...	IA
Brâhûi ...	*pi-un*	*xis-un*	*ma-un* } *môn* }	*xar-un*	*pusk-un*	IA

We may preliminarily note here that the most widespread among the Dravidian names of colours are those for 'red' and 'white' while the words for 'green', 'black' and 'yellow' are shared in common by the southern speeches alone.

Further, it is noteworthy that the names for the generic idea of 'colour' are independent developments in the separate dialects.

I. 'White'

The predominant type is constituted of the following :—

Tamil *veḷ-*, *veṇ-*, *vâl-*
Mal. *veḷ-*, *veṇ-*
Old Tel. *vella*, *vellani*
Kann. *biḷ-*
Tuḷu *boḷ-*
Tôḍa *bel-*
Kûvi *vel-*
Kuru<u>kh</u> *billî*
Brâhûi *pi-un* 'white', 'silver'.
Cf. Malto *biḍ-yu* 'bright', 'white'.

In a separate paper of mine ('Dravidic Miscellany', *Indian Antiquary*, 1931), I have discussed these forms and related them to the base-group * *ve-ḷ*, * *væ-ḷ* of Dravidian.

Other words in the dialects, structurally different from this group are the following :

Kûvi *lôṅgi* 'bright', 'white'—apheresized from *vil-aṅg-* or *tuḷ-aṅg-* 'to shine'. Tel. *tella* is connected with Tam. *teḷ-*, Kann. *tiḷi* 'clear, bright'.

Kuru<u>kh</u> *pendrô* and Malto *peṇḍo*—probably connected with Indo-âryan *pâṇḍu*.

II. 'Red'

Tam. *śem-*, *śev-*, *śey* 'red'.
Mal. *cem-*, *cev-*, colloquial *cov-*
Kann. *kem-*, *kes-*
Tuḷu *kem-*
Tôḍa *kem-*, *cem-*
Kuru<u>kh</u> *xẽs-ô*
Brâhûi *xis-un*
Malto *qeso*

The literary dialects show the respective forms from the most ancient past that we know of; and most of these forms are current to-day. Old Telugu has representatives of this group in compounds

like *cendâmara* 'red lotus', but Modern Telugu uses *errani* with which we may compare Tamil *eri* 'glowing light', *eruvai* 'blood' 'copper', Kannaḍa *eruva* 'redness'.

The initial *k*- of Kannaḍa and Tuḷu, *x*- of Brâhûi and Kurukh and *q*- of Malto are related to *c*- of Malayâḷam and *ś*- of Tamil.

The nasal transcribed as -*m*- of the southern bases appears in compounds where the second component qualified by the base for 'red' has an initial consonant; while -*s*- of Kannaḍa crops up before an initial vowel in the second component. I have pointed out elsewhere [1] that these features should explain the origin of -*m*- and -*s*-. -*m*-, according to this view, is a 'checking nasal' which originally cropped up before plosives in compounds like *kendâmara* 'red lotus,' and then came to be regarded as a part of the base; while -*s*- of Kannaḍa (and -*s*- of northern forms) developed from an original -*y*- (*cf.* Tamil *cey* 'red') which in intervocal positions changed regularly to the sibilant in Kannaḍa and other dialects in certain circumstances defined by me elsewhere.[1] Kannaḍa *bem*- (before consonants) beside *bes*-, *bis*- 'hot' (before vowels) presents a striking analogy to *kem*- and *kes*- in respect of this alternation of nasal (*m*, *ṅ* or *n*, according as the following consonant is labial or velar or dental) and -*s*-.

III. 'BLACK'

Group (i) Tamil *karu-mai* 'blackness', *kaṛuppu*.
Mal. *kaṛu-tta* 'black'.
Kann. *kaṛu*, *kanda*, *kaṛe*. *kappu* 'black'.
Tuḷu *kaja*
Old Tel. *kaṛṛa*, *kaṛṛi*, *kanda*
Tôḍa *kar*
Kûvi *kad-ili*

The occurrence of representatives of this group in the ancient literary texts of Tamil, Telugu and Kannaḍa attests their antiquity. Telugu alone uses a different word *nallani* (adapted from IA ?) for 'black' in modern usage; the other southern dialects use the old forms still to denote this colour.

It is interesting to note that Tôḍa *kor* is used alike for 'black', 'blue' and 'green', according to Pope (Outlines of Tôḍa Grammar, page 11).

The change of the original cerebral -*ṛ*- to -*j*- in Tuḷu and to -*nd*- (through intermediate *nd'*-) in Telugu and Kannaḍa is regular.

Though Kûi now uses the Oriya loan-word *kâli* for 'black', this speech preserves the old Dravidian base in *grî-p* 'to be burnt *black*'

[1] 'A Problem of Dravidian Phonology,' *JOR*, 1931.

(*cf.* Tamil *kaṟu-ttal*), where owing to accent-shift the vowel in the initial syllable has been aphœresized and the vowel of the second syllable has been lengthened.

Gôṇḍi also preserves the base in *karv-* 'to be burnt black,' though the actual word for 'black' in this dialect is a loan from Indo-âryan viz. *kâli*.

Group (ii)—

Kurukh *môxârô* 'black'.
Malto *margθn*' blackess'.
Brâhûi *ma-un*, *môn* 'black, dark'.

cf. Kurukh *kirâti môxârô mañjas* 'by starving he has become black'; Malto *niṅge kaḍoṇḍ taliṅ poṇḍγrote ba margθrote parymaleke* 'thou canst not make one hair of thy head white or black'; Brâhuî *dâsâ maun e* 'it's dark now.'

Kurukh has *max* 'to grow dark,' while Kurukh *mâxâ* and Malto *maqe* signify 'night'. We may compare these with southern *maṅg* 'to become dim, dark' and Telugu *mâpu* 'darkness, night.' All the northern words (Kurukh, Malto and Brâhûi), appear to be derived from a Dravidian base whose dominant semantic constituent is 'dimness, darkness.'[1]

IV. 'Green'

Only the southern dialects show related words for 'green':—

Tamil *pay*, *paśu*, *pacc-ai*
Mal. *pay*, *pacca*
Kann. *pasi* 'green'.
Tuḷu *paji*
Telugu *pasur*

The base appears to be *pay-* 'tender, soft, green' from which a large number of south Dravidian words have been derived. Among non-southern forms, Brâhûi *bai* 'green grass fit for grazing' on the one hand, and Brâhûi *pusk-un*, *posk-un* 'yellow' (cf. Tel. *pasupu* 'yellow') may be related.

The idea of 'green' is expressed in Brâhûi by *xar-un* which means also 'fruitful,' 'blue'; this word is directly allied to Tamil *kâr* 'greenness, flowering period of plants,' Kurukh *xor* 'to sprout, as of plants,' Brâhûi *xarr* 'to sprout,' and Kûi *gâp-* [< * *gârp*] with the same meaning.

V. 'Yellow'

All the southern dialects have *mañjaḷ* which ,appears to be exclusive to the south with the meaning 'saffron, yellow'.

Kûi *siṅga*, Kûvi *hıṅga* 'turmeric, yellow' are from an Indo-âryan loan-word ultimately traceable to *sṛṅgavera*.

[1] 'Dravidic Studies,' *ER*, August 1930.

We have already referred to Brâhûi *pusk-*, *posk-* and compared it to Telugu *pasume* 'yellow.' The interchange of the names of colours, especially of the less conspicuous ones, is common especially in the uncultivated dialects: Tel. *pasume* 'yellow,' basically related to the words for 'green' is an instance; other instances are Tôḍa *kor* for 'blue' and 'green' besides 'black,' Gôṇḍi *kam-k-al* (basically related in structure to 'red') denoting 'yellow,' Kuvi *kâd* standing for 'black' and 'blue.'

VI. 'Colour'

Native Dravidian words for the generic idea of 'colour' exist, so far as we can see, only in Tamil and Malayâḷam, Old Tamil *kêḷ*, *keḷu* originally meaning 'red' occurs in the texts with the generic meaning *cf.* Tolkâppiyam, Śolladigâram, Sutra, 303, குருவுங் கெழுவு நிறனாகும்மெ where *kuru* is a *tadbhava* from IA √*ghṛ* while *keḷu* possibly and *niṛ-am* certainly are native. In the Malayâḷam compound *kêḷa-mân* 'red deer' the original specific meaning of *keḷu*, *kêḷ* seems to be mirrored; *niṛ-am* 'colour' is not only found in ancient Tamil and Malayâḷam texts but is still the common word for 'colour' in these two speeches. It is related to words like Tamil *niṛ-ai* 'prosperity, abundance,' Mal. *niṛ-avu*, Kannaḍa *niṛ-i* 'excellence' and ultimately traceable to *nil-*, *niṛ* of the south with the basic signification 'to be straight, proper, etc.'

For the generic idea of 'colour', the other southern dialects use Indo-âryan loan-words. Kannaḍa, Tulu and Telugu have *baṇṇa*, *vaṇṇa* which are apparently Prâkrit-derived (Skt. *varna*). The Sanskrit words *varna* and *châya* are also used in Telugu. Kurukh in the north has *baran* (IA *varṇa*) while Brâhûi has adopted new Indo-âryan *raṅg*.

Conclusion

The significant facts emerging from the above discussions of the Dravidian words for 'colours' and for the 'operations of the senses' may be summed up thus:—

1. The widespread distribution, in the dialects, of the following would illustrate how certain groups have resisted the inroads of time and foreign influence:—
   (*a*) certain sets of words for 'seeing' and 'hearing';
   (*b*) expressions denoting the specific tastes of 'sweetness' and 'bitterness';
   (*c*) forms signifying 'white' and 'red'.
2. A certain degree of 'cultural' divergence among the dialects is indicated by the existence of sets of words common only to the south and to central Dravidian (*e.g.*, Gr. iv [*pâr*, etc.] for observing,'

Gr. vi [*eṉ-*, etc.] for 'thinking') and by the existence of certain other sets shared by the southern dialects alone (*e.g.*, Gr. iii [*nôḷ*-etc.] for 'looking at', words for 'sour', 'saltish').

3. The fact that the central and northern speeches show mostly Indo-âryan loan-words wherever native words are absent, would point directly to the strong influence of this family on these Dravidian speeches.

4. The abstract ideas of 'smell', 'taste' and 'colour' are generally speaking, conveyed by borrowings from Indo-âryan. Tamil-Mâlayâḷam alone appears to have developed native words for the abstract idea of 'colour.'

5. The 'abstractions' of 'knowing', 'understanding', 'thinking' appear to have had their inception from a fairly early stage, since there exist native groups of words shared by members of more than one division of Dravidian.

6. The southern speeches generally, and Tamil particularly, possess representatives of most of the word-groups in the cases discussed in this essay. This 'conservatism' of Tamil and the other southern speeches is further illustrated by the fact that wherever the word-groups imply or denote semantic change, these speeches of the south, generally speaking, preserve the older significations side by side with the new semantic growths.

DUTCH BEGINNINGS IN INDIA PROPER (1580–1615)

BY

T. I. POONEN, M.A.

INTRODUCTION.

While the ancient Greeks came to India solely as conquerors, modern European nations began their contact with this country essentially as traders. From very early times commercial relations used to exist between Europe and Asia. In this trade, spices took a very important place. Of these a staple product was pepper, the berry of a vine growing in India and the islands of Asia. It was used in Europe by all who could afford the luxury of a seasoning, but for common use the price was prohibitive. More expensive than even pepper were cloves costing two and three times as much as pepper. They were used for seasoning food and drink and also as medicine. A similar purpose was also served by cinnamon, nutmegs and mace; second only to pepper among medieval luxuries was ginger. Ginger was on the borderland between medicine and table luxuries. Other articles imported into Europe from the East were pearls from the Indian Ocean, indigo and cotton cloth in its finished form and as raw material as also manufactured cotton and silk goods.

2. The Turkish conquest blocked the land routes from India to Europe. The Portuguese were the first European nation to discover a sea route to India. Relying on the award made by Pope Alexander VI, they preserved this new-found sea route as a monopoly for themselves. Other European nations did not feel it as a grievance because they could buy Asiatic goods from Lisbon. The Portuguese ports were at first open to the traders of Amsterdam and the Dutch carried on a vigorous trade in Europe out of the Asiatic goods brought by Portugal. At the end of 1580 the sovereignty of Spain and Portugal was united in the hands of Philips II, the classic bigot of modern times. For sixty years the Spanish connection lasted. The Spanish, being the determined enemies of the Protestant Netherlanders, closed the Portuguese ports to Dutch trade. Thus the Dutch were compelled to challenge the Portuguese supremacy at sea. The former accordingly sought to establish direct commercial relations with countries where Spain and Portugal still enjoyed a practical monopoly[1] and set themselves to attack the Portuguese all over the world not only to punish thereby the Spanish monarchy for

[1] Anderson: *Historical and Chronological Deduction of the Origin of Commerce.*

its cruel treatment of them, but also to stock their markets once more with the products of the East which they had begun as from a northern Venice to furnish to France, England, Scotland, Denmark and Germany.

3. In the modern history of India a large place, ought necessarily to be given to the activities of the Dutch if the subject is properly explored. During the sixty years' subjection of Portugal to Spain, her supremacy in the East passed to the English and the Dutch. 'The capture of the Indian trade seemed to Holland a continuation of her just revolt against Portugal and Spain, a heritage from her hard subjection.' (Hunter.) While the achievements of their Portuguese predecessors and their French and English successors have been adequately chronicled, the story of the Dutch in India still remains a comparatively sealed book.[1]

Yet the story is an intensely interesting one and deserves to be studied with care. It is true that there is no Dutch period in Indian history in the sense we have a Muhammadan or a British period as the Dutch never exercised sway over the whole of the land. Yet for nearly a century and a half they formed an important political force in Southern India and for two centuries they exercised a vital influence on the commerce and industry of India. It is well known that the Portuguese commercial supremacy in Eastern waters began to be challenged by the Dutch early in the 17th century and by 1663 all their territorial possessions in India with the exception of Goa, Daman, and Diu passed into the hands of the Dutch. It was early in 1825 that the Dutch were finally dispossessed by the English of all commercial and territorial gain in India. The history of their transactions and institutions in India thus forms a very important tract in the unexplored regions of modern Indian history. It would be presumptuous for a single scholar to aspire to cover the whole ground chronologically or to examine all the problems connected with the subject, but the topic is one which lends itself to study bit by bit.

[1] For this there are various reasons. In the first place history is rarely just to vanquished causes. To-day the Dutch flag flies nowhere in India proper and hardly anything remains to remind the traveller of the 'one hundred and seventy fortified stations in this India' which the Dutch once held except 'a few ruined bastions of the old forts, the massive tombs in the old cemeteries dotted about the coast, and a few volumes of Dutch records in the archives' (Forrest : *Cities of India*) of the Governments of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, Cochin and the Government of India. In view of the enduring dominion of the Dutch in the East Indies, few people ever realise that for two centuries the Dutch played a very prominent part in the affairs of this country. Most Dutch scholars have cared only to study the story of their enduring island dominion while Indian students and English scholars are disabled because the sources for the narration of the history of the Dutch in India lie in an unfamiliar language, namely Dutch, and when in manuscripts in an unfamiliar script. (Moreland : *From Akbar to Aurangzeb*).

4. At the beginning of the 17th century Northern India was a political whole under the strong arms of the Moguls. In the Deccan, Bijapur and Golconda were the only Muhammadan States which retained their independence. The great Hindu empire of Vijayanagar had been destroyed by the Muhammadans at the battle of Talikotta (1565). The Raja of Chandragiri, the titular descendant of the Vijayanagar house, exercised some sort of suzerainty over the Hindu nobles called Naiks like the rulers of Tanjore and Madura who were virtually independent in their own territories. In the extreme south, Cannanore, Calicut, Cochin and Travancore were the only states of importance. Of these the premier state and the only one economically important was Calicut on the pepper-yielding coast of Malabar. The Zamorin (Samudri, ruler of the sea) though the suzerain of the Malabar princes, found himself opposed almost at every turn by Cochin, the ally of the Portuguese. None of these states, the Great Mogul included, had a proper navy. While lords of the mainland they were utterly powerless on the sea. The Portuguese had succeeded in establishing their maritime suzerainty over Eastern waters. This was done in three ways. Certain sea routes were declared to be the monopoly of the King of Portugal, and no other nation was permitted to make use of them. Secondly, certain commodities were singled out for export only by the Portuguese; and thirdly, Indian vessels plying along the coast were compelled to pay toll to and take licenses from the Portuguese. Thus, in the days of the Emperor Akbar, the Portuguese maritime supremacy was complete, and the Moguls who had established their dominion in India as early as twenty-eight years after the arrival of Vasco da Gama were paying tolls to the Portuguese for their vessels. One feature connected with sovereignty has also to be noted in this connection. The Portuguese when they arrived in India found that the West Coast rulers were accustomed to permit Chetty merchants from the East Coast to form themselves into an autonomous community with laws and institutions of their own. Thus what is called mercantile extra-territorialism was already prevalent in India when modern European nations began to effect their settlements. The Portuguese and the Dutch merely accepted the prevalent arrangement. When these nations decided to settle merchants at any port, their position towards the authorities had to be laid down with precision because, in the absence of the ships, the few Europeans on the land would be dependent on them for protection. The authorities at Calicut, Masulipatam and Pulicat were familiar with the institution of mercantile extra-territoriality, but the Great Mogul had the outlook of central Asia where such ideas were not known and in his Empire the grant of a concession was not a matter of course; but even here and

in Golconda the Europeans could on occasions make war successfully on sea because the Indian States maintained no naval forces. Thus the usual course of trade was broken from time to time by events which are described as reprisals and which consisted of coercive measures taken against Indian-owned ships. These measures were acts of war. The State infringed a convention and current principles of international morality permitted the sufferers to exact redress by force. In the matter of efficiency the superiority lay definitely with the Europeans. (Moreland).

CHAPTER I.

FIRST ATTEMPTS ON INDIAN SOIL.

It was in the reign of Akbar the Great when the Portuguese maritime sovereignty over Eastern waters was in its full force that the Dutch first made their appearance in India proper. The aim of the Dutch when they first came into India was to destroy the Spanish-Portuguese monopoly. Later they are found engaged in bitter rivalry with the English. Eventually the Dutch lost ground in India and the English emerged as victors. But it was the Dutch and not the English who broke the Portuguese monopoly. This was the great historic contribution of the Dutch in India.

2. The originator of Dutch commerce in India was Linschotten who reached Goa on the 21st September 1583 as Secretary to the Archbishop of Goa. He stayed in Goa for five years and left after the Archbishop's death, sailing from Cochin on the 20th January 1589. His *Itinerario* revealed that the colonial empire of the Portuguese was rotten and that an energetic rival had every chance of supplanting them. The return of Linschotten from India and of Cornelius Houtman in 1594 from Lisbon where he had been imprisoned furnished the Dutch with the necessary information for undertaking the Eastern voyage. Cornelius Houtman set out to the East in 1595 as the commander of four vessels equipped by the company for distant countries in 1585. On his return from the East he took many inhabitants of Malabar and Abdul, a pilot of Guzerat, a man of great abilities and perfectly well acquainted with the coast of India.[1]

[1] Whether Houtman had previously visited India is a matter about which we cannot be sure. If he had done so there was no reason why he should offer presents to the Portuguese for learning the route and why Linschotten does not say a word about him. But against this we have the words of Montanus that for many years Houtman had rendered faithful service to the Portuguese and Spanish merchants who were in India and that he had served long in East India on the Portuguese ships.

3. The year 1602 marks the beginning of the Dutch attempt to trade in Guzerat and of their first intercourse with the kingdom of Delhi. The merchants Hans de Wolff and Lafer arrived at the island of Surat then one of the most eminent cities for trade in India.[1] As the merchants arrived on the island of Surat they received great kindness. [2]The Dutch merchants felt that there was sufficient profit to make and that they would get sufficient pepper. So they wrote to Batavia that, if ships were available, two should be immediately sent to Surat. Hearing from some Malabarees who had come to Surat that there were places in Malabar where there were no Portuguese they proceeded to Malabar. They were told that pepper could be obtained there for 25 riáls[3] per para and that a fort was available for the Dutch in Malabar if they dared to trade. At Calicut however the merchants were seized by the Portuguese, taken to Goa and there hanged. Not having the nerve power to crush their rivals by sea, the Spaniards used underhand methods. The attempt at settling on the coast of Malabar was entirely unsuccessful.[4]

4. The next event in the story of Dutch enterprise in India is the voyage of Steven Van der Hagen (1603). From the earliest

[1] Situated between the Red Sea and Persian Gulf on the West and the Ganges valley of the East, it was from old time a centre of great trade. Besides Guzerat was exceedingly fertile. A large number of rivers great and small discharged their waters into the Gulf of Cambay. Widely different crops were grown in the valleys of these rivers. Besides grains, peas, beans, rice and sugar there were two other wares which were of considerable importance in Indo-European trade, namely indigo and cotton clothes. The indigo was required for European consumption but the cotton clothes were sent to the Archipelago. In this region Surat situated at the mouth of the Tapti was the most important place for European trade. A great deal of goods was consumed by the Mogul Empire, the Moslem Deccan states and the decaying Vijayanagar chiefs. In the Mogul Empire unlike the territories on the East coast where princes were numerous and comparatively weak and unable to resist European attempts to build fortified places, no European nation would be allowed to obtain a strong position by establishing forts. Terpstra : Surat.

[2]The merchandise generally in demand consisted of lac, kerseys of various colours and tin. Guns were greatly desired, also saffron, velvet of different colours, Danish fleeces, corals and lead. Among the local produce mention is made of indigo and iron. Pepper brought from elsewhere was also available. All goods exported from Surat had to pay three per cent as duty and all import had to pay two and half per cent of the price.

[3] A Spanish rial of eight may be taken as equivalent to two rupees (Moreland, p. 330.)

[4] In 1602 the Dutch colonial enterprise underwent an important transformation. At first there were several trading organisations whose mutual rivalry led to much trouble. The plurality of the East Indian societies formed in Holland created much disorder and clashing in their commerce. They had to buy spices in the East at very high prices and sell their goods at home at very low prices. To obviate this the States General compelled the Directors of all the fifteen companies to unite for the future into one company. To this united company called the *Algemeen Geoctroyeerde Oost Indische Compagnie*, the States General of Holland granted the sole commerce to the East Indies for twenty-one years from the 20th March 1602. Their joint stock consisted of 66,00,000 guilders (about £ 600,000). The constitution of the company which lasted through its lifetime was of a complicated nature and aimed at

days of the United Company, India was one of the countries marked out for commercial operations in the East. The ubiquitous hostility of the Portuguese made it necessary for the Dutch to make use of naval forces. Thus Admiral Steven van der Hagen who set out on the first important voyage undertaken by the new United Company with a fleet of thirteen ships manned by 1,180 persons and having nearly a million guilders[1] worth on board was given by the Council of Seventeen, as the home directors were called, an unconcealed war manifesto including the Indian coast within the sphere of operations.[2] The Admiral was instructed to visit the West Coast of India and to promise good peace to the kings of Cambay, Dabol, Calicut and Ceylon and assure them that every year they would be visited by a fleet for helping them against the Portuguese. When three vessels left Malabar, if one was left at Cambay the other two at least were to enquire in Sumatra what business was to be done in Bengal and then to go to Bengal and Coromandel for buying with the money they had on board cotton cloth, rice, peas, beans and other wares. Mention is made of the piece-goods trade at Pulicat and Masulipatam on the East Coast. A circumstance which specially recommended Masulipatam was the weakness of the Portuguese in the northern regions. Van der Hagen was clearly told of the necessity of taking offensive action for the furtherance of the Dutch trade against the Spaniards, Portuguese and their adherents. On coming to the West coast of India proper, he was, if possible, to take enemy ships and burn them in those waters, to show the Dutch flag before Goa, the centre of Portuguese power in India, and to conclude alliances with the princes of India. He carried two letters written in the Portuguese language for all Indian princes and a private letter to the Great Mogul to whose kingdom Cambay belonged. He was not able to take any prize before Goa but some shots were exchanged with the castle and the Portuguese on the coast. The fleet then sailed southwards. Van der Hagen sought in vain for

reconciling the warring interests of various groups of political entities partly of Amsterdam and Zeeland. By the charter, the company was invested with authority to make peace or war with the Eastern princes, to create forts, choose its own governors, maintain garrisons, and to nominate officers for the conduct of the police and administration of justice. The creation of such a company was nothing less than an *imperium in imperio*. A new state was erected within the state. The company ruled by its seventeen Directors became an important instrument alike of commerce and conquest.

[1] A guilder $\frac{5}{6}$ of a rupee. (Moreland).

[2] In volume I of *Begin ende Voortgangh*, the writer after referring to the capture of a Portuguese vessel says, '*Op welcke tijdinge weder en vloote van dertheen Zhepen onder Steven Van der Hagen 18 December daerwartz voer.*' (= On receipt of which news a fleet of thirteen ships sailed thither under Steven Van der Hagen on the 18th December).

refreshments at Cannanore. He left this place quickly at the request of the king as his ancestors for more than a century had been in alliance with the Portuguese to whose vengeance he would not needlessly expose himself.

5. The Admiral cherished great expectations of a visit to Calicut, the ancient but deeply decayed capital of the Zamorin, the irresistible enemy of the Portuguese power in India. Here the Dutch were received with friendship by the Councillors of the Zamorin and the natives. Portuguese hostility was not however lacking. Twenty Spanish-Portuguese frigates attacked the fleet, but were repulsed. The Admiral met the Zamorin near the village of Chettua. Though the Dutch fleet was followed by the Portuguese, the Dutch cannon wrought havoc among the latter. On the 11th of November 1604 the Admiral came to the land from the fleet with three ship counsellors and the under merchants and shortly afterwards entered into an agreement with the Zamorin, a grave man of about fifty years, who received the Dutch with great kindness. The outcome of the meeting was that Steven Van der Hagen in the name of the States General and his Royal Highness Maurice, Prince of Orange, concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with the Zamorin of Calicut. The treaty stipulated[1] :—

(1) a close alliance, eternal and unbreakable, for the oppression of the Portuguese and for driving out all their associates out of all the lands of his Majesty and also out of the whole of India ;

(2) that with the next opportunity ships and people should be sent to trade at Calicut and that merchants might be stationed for that purpose. To effect this on the best opportunity a fortress should be built which should remain in the hands and dominion of the Dutch for all time ;

(3) no peace should be made by either side with the Portuguese without the other being informed, and if the other side found it oppressive, then the treaty of peace should not be entered into ;

(4) the inhabitants of the coast of Malabar south of Goa to Cape Comorin should not be permitted to set out on any navigation enterprise without having first received a passport of the Zamorin for the same, and if anything is caught it should be declared confiscated to the king.

[1] De Jonge, vol. iii, p. 150. Macleod, vol. i.
Begin ende Voortgang, vol. ii, p. 7.
Heeres : Corpus Diplomaticum. Neerlando Indicum, pp. 30–31.

6. This alliance is important not so much for its subsequent effects as for the clearest indication that even from the very outset India proper was not outside the orbit of Dutch activities. Van der Hagen's visit brought about the first political understanding between the Dutch and a prince of India proper. The acquisition of military power however did not lie in the purposes of the Directors of the Company and the fortress promised by the Zamorin does not seem to have been taken by the Dutch. However, the treaty illustrates the general lines of Dutch policy in India. They would ally themselves with native powers. They would act against the Portuguese whose monopoly of Eastern trade was looked upon as a grievance. Yet, with strange inconsistency, the Dutch aimed not only to get for themselves a share of the Indian trade, but also to get a monopoly of it on very favourable terms excluding all others.

The Dutch Enter Coromandel.

It was also in the reign of Akbar that Dutch trade was opened with the Coromandel coast. From Calicut Van der Hagen had despatched the yacht *Delft* for this purpose. In the spring of 1605 the vessel reached Masulipatam (literally the town of fish) a very busy seaport famous for the export of cotton piece-goods since the dawn of authentic history. This place was in possession of the King of Golconda (Mohammed Koeli 1581–1611). Compared to other coast places of this kingdom, the circumstances of anchoring were good. Thanks largely to the co-operation of a Jew named Azzelan, the Dutch were fortunate to secure firm footing at Masulipatam and to enter into commercial relations with the people. Although there were Portuguese merchants in the town, their rivals were welcomed by the Indian authorities. The *Delft* which had introduced the Dutch to Masulipatam left early in May 1605 with the first cargo of cotton goods for Achin and Bantam. The senior merchant Pieter Ysaac Eyloff remained behind with a small number of assistants to set up a permanent factory which at this time did not denote a place of manufacture but merely a trading post where factors or agents were stationed. Thus this first voyage of the *Delft* to Coromandel had weighty consequences for the Company as the commander and merchants of that vessel were the founders of that cloth trade of the Dutch on the East Coast which was destined later to be so extensive and extremely important.

REFERENCES

Clive Day ... A history of commerce.
Anderson ... Historical and chronological deduction of the origin of commerce.
Abe Reynal ... History of the Indies.
Encyclopædia van Nederlanzch Indie.
Macleod ... De Oost Indische Compagnie Alz Zeemogendheid in Azie.
De Jonge ... De Opkomst van het Nederlandzch Gezag in Oost Indie.
Terpstra ... Surat.
,, ... Koromandel.
Oaten ... European travellers.
Hakluyt Society ... Linschotten.
,, ... Begin end Voortgang.
Valentijn ... Oudh en nieuwn Oost Indie.
Heeres ... Corpus Diplomaticum Neerlando Indicum.
Edmundson ... History of Holland.
,, ... Anglo Dutch rivalry.
Moreland ... India at the death of Akbar.
,, ... From Akbar to Aurangzeb.
Bal Krishna ... Commercial relations between India and England.
Chij's, J. A. Van Der. Geschiedenis der stichting van de vereenigde, O. I. C.

CHAPTER II.

DUTCH FORTUNES ON THE WEST COAST IN THE EARLY DAYS OF JAHANGIR (1605-10.)

[*Note.*—The first half of the seventeenth century is a period of prolonged commercial experiments. Of this century the first quarter is covered by the reign of Jahangir. In many respects that reign constitutes the real commencement of active Dutch operations in India. Deliberate attempts were made during this period to contest the Portuguese maritime supremacy, and the Portuguese, perceiving their danger, endeavoured both by force and diplomacy to thwart the Dutch. The latter succeeded in settling down definitely both in Coromandel and Guzerat, and from these districts they expanded their activities to the interior. For the purpose of carrying on their trade unmolested, they entered into treaty relations with the inland powers. They continued their efforts to secure a footing in Malabar. The English, who had preceded the Dutch in Guzerat, now appeared on the Coromandel Coast and we notice the growth of bitter commercial rivalry despite a few years of accord. The trade of the country was in various ways affected by these new commercial developments. Owing to the disturbed political conditions in the south, the Dutch felt the necessity of having a fortified centre. The organisation of the Dutch in

the East also underwent important modifications. From the viewpoint of a student of Dutch affairs the reign may be divided into three periods.

(i) 1605-1610, the year in which the twelve years' truce between Portugal and Holland was commenced in India and the first Dutch Governor General for the East was appointed.

(ii) 1610-1621 which marked the end of the twelve years' truce.

(iii) 1621-1627 the year which marks the departure of Pelsart who has left an account of Dutch trade in Agra. By that time the Dutch had become active participants in the trade of India.]

Ineffective attempts were made during this period to gain a foothold on the West Coast. The appearance of the Dutch in Eastern waters was an infraction of the Portuguese supremacy. Hence the two nations were in a state of war towards each other. Caerden, who reached the Malabar Coast in October 1607, attacked native craft more than once thinking that they belonged to the Portuguese. Admiral Verhoff, who sailed from Holland in 1607, was secretly instructed to try to catch the Spanish Portuguese fleet in the waters of Goa. On September 19, 1608, the fleet appeared before Goa, where all that was possible was done to trace and destroy the caracques of the enemies. The ships lay before the bar of Goa till the 2nd of October awaiting the fleet from Portugal. Nothing of it had arrived except a caracque which touched somewhere north of Goa. Thus the cruise in the waters of Goa had no other result except that only a caracque was chased and burned by the Portuguese themselves.

(*a*) SURAT

At Surat, no appreciable progress was made during this period. What was performed by the Dutch in the early days after De Wolff and Lafer remains mysterious. In 1607 there existed an establishment under Van Deynsen. This is certain. But we cannot say how long that had been in existence. It may have had its origin in the voyage of the ships sent to Cambay by Van der Hagen.[1] The cargo brought by Van Deynsen to Surat amounted to between 12,000 and 13,000 guilders. It was mainly intended to be spent on indigo. The Portuguese however caused him much trouble; his servants died, and then the under-merchant Jan Hussen, after which Van Deynsen had himself to perform the difficult task of keeping the affairs of the

[1] The statement by Hussan 'Dyt allies is by myn k—sse ende weet in ons logye tot Surat ghebleven. Ady (heden) der 31st August 1606!' (All this, according to my knowledge, remains in our lodge on this day, the 31st August 1606), makes it clear that the factory of which we hear in 1607 was already in existence in 1606. The exact date of its starting is uncertain. According to Pieter van Dam, the author of 'Beschrevingh', Van Deynsen was sent to Surat in 1606 and reached Surat in May of that year.

Company going. The Portuguese Michiel Botiolle made a claim for money for a certain quantity of ivory. To settle this dispute, both parties had to go to the khankhanan. The dispute was settled in his favour. But he heard much about Portuguese hostility and native ill-will which disheartened him. He shot himself dead. In May 1608 the death of Van Deynsen was known in Coromandel. Van Deynsen's goods were held in custody by the native authorities at Burhanpur and Surat.[1] The Governor-General P. Both held that they of Surat had employed cruel, godless and unheard-of means in destroying the person of their valiant servant David Van Deynsen. The Governor-General demanded the seizure of as many ships, goods and persons of Surat as he could without agitating the friendly kings and people of India. 'When the deeds of the people of Surat are shown to them they (the friendly kings) shall ask satisfaction for that death and compensation for the losses suffered by the Company, by refusals and postponements. You shall by reprisals do justice and give satisfaction until according to justice they give you satisfaction.'

2. With the untimely death of Van Deynsen, the establishment at Surat came to an end. But indirect relations continued through Guzerat merchants who dealt with the Dutch at Surat. English letters from Surat (30th August 1609, Letters Received) say that the Hollanders filled the country with lead in pigs. However, though Surat was one of the most eminent cities for trade in all India and though it commanded an extensive commerce by reason of its being the port of the Mogul Empire, the Moslem Deccan States and the Vijayanagar chiefs, and though it was a very convenient place for the exchange of Malabar, the Deccan and up-country goods, the commercial importance of the place for the Dutch does not begin during this quinquennium.

(*b*) MALABAR.

On the 1st of November 1607 the Gelderland came before Cannanore where an arrangement was made with the Raja wherein he said that the Portuguese had been there about 100 years but were never good friends and that they were false and not trusted, but in all lands it was known that Prince Maurice kept his word in all things and because the Raja had much inconvenience from the Portuguese he requested help and assistance and when he obtained this as well as trade from the Prince, he would expel the Portuguese and show obedience to the Prince. On the 9th November Caerde presented to the Zamorin a letter of Prince Maurice with a present of two fire-

[1] *Plakaat* book for 1609–14/27 Nov.

locks, a mirror and other things. Caerden received a jewel of gold as large as a rix dollar inlaid with precious stones and a golden chain which the Zamorin hung on his neck. The treaty of 1604 was renewed.

2. On the 9th of October came now the Admiral Verhoff in person with his whole fleet before Calicut and a few days later signed a treaty with the Zamorin which marked an enlargement and strengthening of the treaty of the agreement already concluded by the Admiral Steven Van der Hagen. In the contract concluded by the Admiral P. W. Verhoff with the Zamorin of Calicut on the 13th October, 1608, references were made to the treaty of the 11th November, 1604, between 'the illustrious high-born and all powerful Samori, Kaiser of Malabar, King of Calicut' on the one side and 'the valiant lord Steven Van der Hagen, Admiral of thirteen large Nedarlandish ships on behalf of the high-born, illustrious, powerful lords States General of the United Netherland provinces, his princely Majesty of Nassau and the noble lords Directors of the East India Company' on the other. That treaty was confirmed. The Zamorin was to render all favourable assistance with ships and people to ruin and destroy the Portuguese. The Company as soon as possible was to send two ships from Bantam with qualified merchants and cargo of the Dutch for carrying on trade in Malabar. They were to drive away Portuguese trade. The Zamorin was to give good dwelling places, and protect Dutch goods from all dangers and be a father to them. The Dutch were not to pay more as tolls for them than the Zamorin's own subjects, and as far as was reasonable to share all their privileges. Verhoff united his ships in the harbour of Cochin, and from there sailed along Ceylon to the Straits of Malacca.

3. Although the treaty with Van der Hagen, twice confirmed, led to no results, the negotiations were not however easily given up. When in 1610 three Dutch ships came to the Coast of Coromandel, two envoys from Tirupapuliyur, namely Cornelis Jacobs Van Breek velt and Hans Bullard were sent overland to the Zamorin with the patent from His Princelike Excellency, a letter of Verhoff, and one from the *Kleyne Sonne*. They took with them besides two Brahmans, an interpreter who was proficient in the Malabar, Malay, Portuguese and Moorish languages, and two coolies. They went with 114 pagodas for expenses on the 16th of May on horseback. They returned probably on the 7th of October with a concluded treaty of alliance, of which the important terms were that (1) The Dutch should have a place for building a lodge, (2) They should pay 2% toll on imports and exports, (3) The Portuguese should be resisted, (4) All the merchants should have free trade with the Dutch. (For translation of full text see Appendix No. 1.)

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER II.

A graphic account of the incident at Calicut is given by Valentjyn (Keltzer's edition, vol. I, page 110) 'He came on the 8th of October at the road of Calicut (the 'Calcutta' of Valentjyn is Calicut) heard there how very well Van Driel had been received by the Zamorin who now sent one of his chiefs to the Admiral to welcome him. The Admiral Verhoff thereupon sent some presents of scarlet, some bunches of fine coral, six large crystal mirrors, two small metal guns, six beautiful fire locks, two beautiful muskets with tesselated stocks, a battle sword with a silver hilt and 200 mats, all in two chests with yellow lac in advance to the prince with his retinue to salute the Kaiser of Malabar who had greeted him on board very stately by one of his counsellors. He found him in his court, decorated most exquisitely and adorned with many jewels with his heir the young prince standing on his side. The Admiral was received by the Kaiser very friendly and his presents were received with much pleasure. The Zamorin took great delight in a large golden coin which had on it the image of Prince Maurice. When Verhoff noted this, he honoured him with the penny and its chain. In return for this the Admiral was given a golden ring with diamonds. Similar presents were also given to other members of the Dutch party. The party had also the honour of seeing the Kaiser's wife, mistresses, and children, and thereafter departed, greatly pleased. On the persistent request of the Interpreter, the Dutch sent further presents, namely many scarlets and 84 mats, also 1 battle sword and 1 small gun through Simon Jansh Hoen, who was therefore presented with a golden ring. The prince, through the counsellors asked them to show their friendship and fulfil the treaty of 1604 by furnishing 6 ships, 2 to occupy Goa, 2 to occupy Cochin and 2 to be in front of Calicut and he added that he would reinforce them with his ships against the Portuguese who were his enemies. The Admiral replied that he would have willingly done so but his difficulties in the East were great.

The above incidents are fully recounted in a letter written by the Admiral Pieter Willemsz Verhoff to the senior merchant and delegate of the Company at Bantam on the 18th October 1608. The Zamorin, the writer says, earnestly besought the Dutch ships to remain on the Coast of Malabar, promising free trade in his State, offering a beautiful store-house for storing Dutch goods and a lodge for the Dutch people so that without doubt there was the possibility of a very good trade being carried for the Dutch nation there. But they understood the circumstances of the south, namely Malacca still belonged to the Portuguese, and Ternate and Tidor were captured by

the Spaniards of Manilla. So they thought they should push on with their voyage to the south. However much the Zamorin might be offended at it, they would be content with his friendship provided they promised as soon as possible to send him some ships. Hence they had directed the ships to advise His Excellency and to recommend very strongly when two or three ships were there (which was sufficient to keep the Coast of Malabar against the Portuguese) to induce them to go there, besides a merchant to trade in Calicut; and procure there for the United Company freedom from tolls and a further signature of passports, besides the signature of the Zamorin, the Kaiser of Calicut. They also sent His Excellency the contract made with him and prayed further to the Admiral, upper merchants and other officers of the ships dwelling on land not to drop the matter, recommending the matter in the highest degree.

Jacques L'Hermite answered on the 19th November 1608 from Bantam to Verhoff's letter that the advice to send two or three ships from there to Calicut could not be carried out as all the ships in that quarter were needed there. They were all in the Moluccas and could not go earlier than August. L'Hermite just added that he thought, subject to correction, that the Dutch trade in Malabar need not be developed as there was nothing there but pepper of which they had already enough. There and in other places pepper was the foundation of all the trade. The expedition to Calicut, like the one to the Mozambique, was a fault of the Directors and the loss of the Moluccas was greatly due to that.

CHAPTER III.

COROMANDEL I.

[*Note.*—Of the fleets which left Holland for the East during the quinquennium under reference some were actually destined for the shores of 'Voor Indie' (India proper) [1]. These were armed fleets which freqnently came in collision with the Portuguese. The Portuguese maritime monopoly which had been in existence for nearly a century thus began to be contested. The Portuguese however did not let their supremacy pass without a struggle and for some years there was a regular tussle between the two nations at sea, while on land the Portuguese resorted to various intrigues and underhand means for frustrating the efforts of the Dutch to establish factories on the mainland. This will be seen from the following account of Dutch fortunes during these five years.

Though pepper formed the material basis of the Indo-European trade, the Dutch at first made no determined efforts to secure pepper from Malabar where

[1] Of the fleet which left Holland in 1605 under Matelieff, the *Kleijne son* and the *Nassau* were destined for Cambay, while the *Groote son* was to proceed to San Thome, the coast of Coromandel and Bengal:—Macleod, vol. i, p. 58. In 1607 similarly the *Gelderland* under Caerden touched the Malabar Coast, p.67, idem.

the Portuguese were strongly established. They were more concerned with the purchase of cloth in India which could be used as a means of buying spices in the Archipelago. Matelieff, the Admiral in charge of the fleet of 1605, thought that the Indian trade should be regarded as purely subsidiary and that while Gujarat could wait, Coromandel must be developed because its cotton goods were the chief medium of trade in the markets further East.[1]

Every Dutch ship that approached the Coromandel Coast is found to burn or despoil Portuguese vessels on its way, while on land the Portuguese endeavoured by clandestine means to prevent the Dutch from securing a firm foothold. On the Golconda Coast, the Dutch found that they could not get on without an understanding with the Golconda Government. To this end, a treaty was concluded. But such was the independence of the provincial government that these treaties remained ineffective and trade was considerably disturbed owing to the greed of Governors. Hence the Dutch sought for openings elsewhere. In Arakan they were welcomed. But they were not able to give the ruler that help which he wanted against the Portuguese. Such help was also being called for from Kandy and by the southern princes. In the South Coromandel a flourishing establishment was opened at 'Tirupapuliyur' in the dominions of the Naik of Ginji, while, at the end of the period, the Dutch were also allowed to open direct trade at Pulicat, where an important variety of the cloth required in the Archipelago was being made. The princes on the Southern Coromandel Coast were found more helpful and possessed of the power to profit. But the negotiations with them had also to be delicately handled. The interference of the troublesome Governors of the North, the dishonesty of some of the Dutch officers themselves and their unwillingness to co-operate with each other also gave trouble. Eventually it was found necessary to place the former factories under a single head. With this departure in policy which synchronises with the coming into operation in the East of the twelve years' truce between Portugal and Holland, and the appointment of the first Dutch Governor General, the first chapter in the history of the Coromandel factories deservedly comes to a close. That history may now be more fully surveyed.]

THE GOLCONDA FACTORIES: EARLY STAGES.[2]

Masulipatam and Petapoli.

The *Delft* reached Masulipatam a second time on the 17th May 1606. The most important names of those who came on board are those of Van Dirk Van Leeuwen and Paulus Van Soldt. On its way to the Coromandel Coast, the *Delft* robbed two Portuguese ships of their most important cargo and at San Thome burned three empty Portuguese ships. On the 26th of April *Van Soldt* and party came before the harbour of Pulicat. Negotiations for trade which were opened with the Governor did not materialise as the Dutch were alarmed of Portuguese intrigues. There was news that about 150 or 250 Portuguese were sent to San Thome while in Pulicat also the

[1] *Begin ende Voortang*, p. 72 of the Journal of Matelieff's voyage.
[2] Terpstra : Kormandel.
Macleod : Do in *De Oost Indische compagnie als zeemogenheid in Azie.*

Portuguese were playing as masters. The Dutch asked for one or two Portuguese hostages before they could land, and this was refused. Thus the negotiations with Pulicat which later became the headquarters of the Dutch possessions wholly miscarried. The Dutch sailed further up, and came on the 3rd May to Petapoli, or Nizamapatam in the territory of the king of Golconda. Petapoli was a more dangerous anchorage for the ships than Masulipatam and not so shut off from the wind. It was marshy and the climate was unhealthy. Yet the Dutch were established there as the red *verwe* of the place kept as the best of all those countries. Van Soldt was honourably received and allowed to trade. The toll to be paid for imports was fixed at 4 per cent. Two most powerful Persian merchants whom Van Soldt visited promised to him to summon all the weavers dwelling thereabout and to make them imitate the sample of the clothes that he bought. Dirk Van Leeuwen who had already been nominated as merchant on the coast by Van der Hagen was appointed head of the newly contemplated lodge. Delivery was now effected according to the samples and a compound was bought for twelve pagodas.

2. Though festally received by the Governor, Sideppa, the merchants did not succeed in concluding a treaty with him. The Governor who on an average cheated 16 per cent wished the tolls to be not lower than 16 per cent for exports and 3½ per cent for imports. He however suggested that if they went to Golconda they might secure more favourable terms. Van Soldt and Pieter Willemsz, the under-merchant at Masulipatam, accordingly proceeded on this embassy. Van Soldt was kindly and magnificently received. On receiving news of a sudden flood at Masulipatam, Van Soldt had to depart suddenly leaving behind Pieter Willemsz. But already he had received favourable promises about the tolls. When he returned to Masulipatam, Van Soldt found the situation miserable. Two of their people were drowned and a bargeman dead. Provisions of the ship were destroyed. On the 19th August, however, Pieter Willemsz returned from Golconda with favourable firmans from the king. Mir Jumla who was very powerful in the kingdom had however made the working of the firman depend on the approval of the Governor Sideppa. That confirmation was also obtained. The firmans are recapitulated in a later treaty.[1] The Company was assured that, in all places where they were or would thereafter be, they need not pay more than an import duty of 4 per cent and an export duty of 4 per cent. All

[1] Document No. 7 in De Jong, vol. iii. and Heeres: *Corpus Diplomaticum Neerlands Indicum*, page 46.

the weavers, dyers, smiths and other artisans working for the Company and having advance of money for the king or other men would not be troubled until the work was completed. Brokers were free to go to the Company's lodge and the Dutch were free to choose whom they pleased without any obligation to accept the Governor's dictation. The Company was excused payment of the tax called *Chappadalla* i.e., the stamp duty on linen amounting to 12 per cent—a privilege not possessed by other nations or even the king's subjects. On the 15th September 1606 the *Delft* left Masulipatam under festive escort with a consignment of 22 packs of cloth from Petapoli and 100 from Masulipatam besides steel, rice, and peas. Van Soldt had an exaggerated idea of the amount of Coromandel steel that could be disposed of in Bantam.

3. To Van Soldt thus belongs the credit of having done thorough and energetic work. A factory was established which was later to contribute much to the great profits derived from overseas regions, and which by its cotton products and food-stuffs was helpful for Dutch trade in the Moluccas. But this advantage was purchased at considerable material sacrifice. The cost of the embassy and presents in Golconda amounted to 3,800 guilders. The company had the advantage that if one place was in jeopardy, they could go to another. However, the men who remained on the Coast were subjected to much vexation. For the confirmation of the Golconda *firman* by the Governor Sideppa, the latter compelled them to lend him without interest a sum of 3,000 pagodas. But that was not the worst. Sideppa had given only his personal confirmation. This did not bind his successors who had to be separately approached. As, in Golconda, the governorship could be filled every year, the Dutch position in Masulipatam was very unstable. The Governor who could be yearly replaced farmed the administration from the king of Golkonda. He of Masulipatam had to pay 180,000 pagodas a year while the Petapoli Governor had to pay 55,000 pagodas. Besides this, the governors had to make large payments to the nobles of the palace. Hence the Governors in their turn oppressed all who had dealings with them. The unreasonableness of the Governors and Sabandhars prevented the Dutch from having free trade at the two places.[1] They would not only refrain from trade with the Dutch, but also forbade the natives to carry on trade with that nation. They let the lodge broken open, and departed saying that they would have rather the Portuguese than their own nation. While the maintenance of the two factories gave to the Dutch two chances for one that the trade would continue to exist, it also involved

[1] Vide Memoir of De Bitter quoted in De Jong.

more oppression and heavier cost. It would have been better if both the factories had not been in that kingdom. But each place produced its distinctive type of cloth.

4. The heads of both factories were independent of each other. But in practice they came frequently into negotiations over the trade. The trade with the natives was more of a complicated nature than any other undertaking of the Company. The Governor of Petapoli had the exclusive right of deciding with whom the Dutch should negotiate for cloth. In Masulipatam, up to the coming of the *Great Sun* (1607) there does not appear to have been any particular trouble.

5. The *Great Sun* was one of the ships of the fleet which left Holland in May 1605 under the Admiral Cornelis Matelieff de Jong. It was to touch Coromandel and the Coast of Bengal to carry from there cotton, linen, rice, and other wares to Bantam. The cargo consisted of 50,000 pounds tintinago 15 pieces velvet, 20,000 pounds iron and 30,000 reals of eight. On the 1st April 1607 the ship came to Petapoli, and now they observed for the first time the existence of two Dutch factories on the coast. Lodewijk Ysaacx who was a member of the high council of the fleet now relieved his brother Pieter Ysaacx. Much persuasion and even threatenings were required to persuade Van Leeuwen to remain at Petapoli ; to instruct his successor Lucas Janssen in the knowledge of the linen. The independence of both factories was given up, the council of the ships commanding that the presidents of each by turn must preside 'for a month.'

6. The Dutch had no trouble as long as the *Great Sun* lay along the coast. But as soon as the ship was gone the natives began to give trouble. Even the goods on which toll was paid were not allowed to be sold. The Governor not only refused to give satisfaction but also asked Lodewijk Ysaacx 20,000 pagodas (apparently as a loan) for making two ships for the king. Though Lodewijk urged that this was a violation of the treaty with Paulus Van Soldt the Governor stuck to his position, saying 'if he yearly did not enjoy some money from us, wherefore should we enjoy the free trade with the diminution of the toll there besides ?' Eyloff was helpless. The Governor had the power to forbid all trade, and the goods were not very safe in the bankshall of Masulipatam. So the Dutch agreed to lend 8,000 pagodas on delivery of goods. Thus the Governor who recently paid back to Pieter Ysaacx in wares a debt of 3,000 pagodas compelled his successor to give a larger loan. The Dutch officers were also forced to yield to the demand of the Governor and the sabandar that to them alone should the goods be sold. Three months were they thus prevented from fetching the goods from the customs house, and

then with such great cost because the Governor of the district changed.

7. At Petapoli, things were not so bad. There the Dutch carried on trade by agreement with the Governor and had also brought under their thumb the supervision of the cloth. The merchants Godia Soheyder and Myr Cedebedy were of great help to them. From the 2nd June 1607, to 1st June 1608, cloth and some steel were brought for 15,485 pagodas. In the same period the purchase at Masulipatam consisted of 17,348 pagodas worth of cloth and steel, and 2,413 pagodas worth of rubies, the latter to Amsterdam and the former first to Atchin and later to Bantam.

First Visit to Arakan.

Not being anxious to continue the Golconda trade under such difficult, uncertain and humiliating conditions, the Dutch in Masulipatam and Petapoli turned their eyes to Arakan, Pegu and Bengal. If these regions yielding food-stuffs could be wrested by the Dutch from the Portuguese it would be of the utmost importance. Bengal produced cotton, and Pegu rubies. Already, the King of Arakan, Salim Shah had himself called the help of the Dutch against the Portuguese. Pieter Willemsz, the under merchant of Masulipatam who had joined in the journey to Golconda was sent as messenger to Arakan assisted by Jan Gerritsz Ruyll, book-keeper of the factory at Petapoli. Pleased with the chance of help against the Portuguese the King of Arakan granted freedom from the toll to the Dutch in the whole of Pegu, Arakan and Bengal. They were also offered the castle of St. Jago if they could be fortunate enough to expel the Portuguese, also different places in Bengal. But the Dutch had come there not in the first place to mix in questions of war but to try to pursue a trade with such future. Already they had bought there as cargoes spices, sandalwood, camphor, ivory, sulphur, porcelain and perhaps yet other wares but not all of them could be sold. They promised more if the rivers of Bengal could be kept safe. From Arakan and Bengal the Dutch could secure cotton, yarn and rubies of which a great portion could find a great sale in Europe. Further the best arrack in the whole of India came from there. Conversely cotton could be sent from Coromandel to Arakan and the surrounding lands from where again they could trade with Atchin in rice. It was thus a promising region. Further, the Dutch hoped that to this place indigo could be transported from the regions of Delhi, Agra, etc., at a less cost than to Surat (where they were despairing of carrying on trade) or other places in the dominions of Cambay.

They would also be able then to do considerable damage to the trade of Aleppo and Venice. Siam, where there was a great demand for Golconda cloth, was close by and offered great promises. To the Council of Masulipatam and Petapoli, Pieter Willemsz sent a firman. Though personally he could not help the king he held out hopes that ships would come with which the King of Arakan took pleasure. Thus Pieter Willemsz had no reason to feel discontented with his work. Though much was not explicitly won a possibility was open to which attention should remain drawn. The success of the mission would it was thought enhance their prestige in Golconda. In 1608 the King of Arakan sent a present to Masulipatam to elicit the Hollanders' favour to him although in those days the Dutch could not for lack of material and money profit by these overtures. Pieter Willemsz returned to Masulipatam some time before the 25th of May, 1608.

HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE PORTUGUESE

Meanwhile hostilities against the Portuguese were being continued. The *Eendracht*, a ship sent from Bantam to the Coromandel with samples of cloth required at Bantam, burned about the 14th February 1608 below Ceylon and at Negapatam a Portuguese junk and four Moorish ships. Further two Moorish ships were sunk aground because they had the Portuguese on board who however wished to effect their escape. Before San Thome a pair of shot was discharged and before Pulicat two Portuguese ships in the harbour were burned. This was the military expedition against the arch-enemy.

FURTHER UNPLEASANTNESS IN GOLCONDA PORTS.

On the 25th March the ship came to Masulipatam. Pieter Ysaacx who was on board now took over charge of the factory. Matters were much worse than when he departed the previous year. During the absence of the Governor, the Sabandhar took the best of the Dutch wares for a very low price on the ground that they were for the king. Pieter Ysaacx protested and asked for the debts due from the Governor. The Sabandhar began openly to abuse the Dutch, demanding that they should break up and trade only with the monsoon as they had badly treated the king who had given them free trade. The Dutch were reproached for not having protected Golconda ships which were taken by the Portuguese. These latter intrigued against the Dutch as much as they could. On the streets the Dutch were not safe. Several times they had been pelted by the Moors with stones. Pieter Ysaacx was indignant and was inclined

to give up the Golconda factories in view of the possibility of Arakan. Trouble arose also at Petapoli over an octroi imposed by the Sabandhar over a certain quantity of porcelain dishes that the Dutch had sold to Godia Soheyder. But it was not so vehement as at Masulipatam and peace was speedily re-established.

A Common Head for the Two Factories

An important change now took place in the organisation of the Golconda factories. It was decided at Bantam that both the factories should be under a general head. Pieter Ysaacx accordingly filled that place, Jan Van Wesick being in subordinate charge of Petapoli.

Official Corruption

On the 3rd June the *Eendracht* left Masulipatam with about 250 packs of cloth and came to Bantam on the 6th October. The clothes brought were not of the best sort, especially those brought by Lucas Jansen. The latter is also charged of having sold large quantities of cotton to the English thus promoting the English trade and giving a set-back to the Dutch trade. This must have been done with the knowledge of Dirck Van Leeuwen both being commissioned clerks on the Coromandel Coast.

The two men now left on the Coromandel Coast had the welfare of the Company in view. Although Van Wesick did not like his subordination to Pieter Ysaacx they worked on the whole with such mutual good understanding as to get over the difficulties the opening period produced for these establishments. The unfortunate end of David Van Deynsen at Surat made it all the more desirable that a regular position should have been created on the East Coast, and the trade secured. The samples sent from Bantam enabled the Dutch to know much better how the cargoes could be paid for with profit for the Company.

While the proximity of the two places led to mutual instruction, it also gave the two Governors a chance to plot against the Dutch. The Governors and the Sabandhars interfered much (witness the great number of documents left by the Dutch after the visit of the *Eendracht*). Godia Soheyder, the merchant, was equally eager for the cargoes which the Dutch wished to sell at Petapoli. He was allowed to fetch a quantity of taftas (Achine side-wear) and Chinese porcelain stealthily so that he might not disturb the Sabhandar. This shows how much the freedom of trade was yet desired by the Dutch. Godia Soheyder was a person of importance in Petapoli and gave

much useful counsel to the Dutch. He brought about the first contact of the Dutch with Pulicat, a place which was later to become so important. He delivered to the Dutch cotton out of this place and thus showed himself very ready to deliver to the Dutch goods according to their samples. Despite the cost of the transport to the Golconda factories, the Pulicat cloth yielded much profit. It is clear that the Dutch exercised great influence on the production alike on the weavers and the dyers. Tours of inspection had to be undertaken by Van Wesick and his successors so that the proper kind of cloth was made. Much solid knowledge was required for the office of factor on the coast and it was absolutely necessary for the Company to secure reliable persons and for the newcomers to take lessons with regard to their business from the old.

Perils of the Golconda Factories

(1) *From native governors :—*

At this time, the Dutch factories had to face perils from two quarters, namely from the native Governments and from the Portuguese. Although there was evidently more peace after the departure of the *Eendracht*, and the situation seemed somewhat to have improved, yet the unpleasantness with the local authorities does not seem to have dropped. On the 12th November 1608, Pieter Ysaacx wrote to L'Hermite that men in both factories could not or only badly trade except with the Governors. Two days later, the two heads wrote that the Dutch had been excluded against their will and had contracted over the cotton with the Governors. Further, the Governors would not perform what they were bound to. However better the position in both factories might be, yet it would be similar and perilous. They expected much good from a second embassy to the court of Golconda, in the first place to acquire security for the money lent to the Governor and further to secure permission to carry more trade with all merchants. The envoy had to take with him to the aforesaid king a gift of curiosities. More than the cost of the gifts it was their character that mattered. We do not know whether the plan was carried out.

(2) *From the Portuguese :—*

The other danger was from the Portuguese. Their captains at Masulipatam and Petapoli did their best to secure the expulsion of the Dutch from the Coast. But in the middle of 1608 it was clear that the natives were decidedly more favourably inclined to the Dutch than to the Portuguese. As action was being taken by the local authorities against the Portuguese, the Dutch wished to make a

factory near the bankshall but it did not speedily come to assault and battery. On the 7th September they heard in Petapoli that a Portuguese armada was found at Armagon for the purpose of sweeping on Petapoli and then against Masulipatam. Immediately news was brought from the Governor of Pulicat that five Portuguese boats lay ready in the river and that twelve others were also expected from Goa to raise and burn Petapoli and Masulipatam. The Dutch in the former place now decided to load with sand and sink in the river their 'fust' that was come from Arakan and thus obstruct the Portuguese approach. On the 8th September however the ease-giving news was received that four miles above Petapoli five boats had passed. On the night of the 9th, near the place, there perished by a hard wind a fust of which some sailors were drowned, and others who sailed to the land were taken prisoners. Though Van Wesick later mentioned that two fusts or geraps had yet to pass, we do not hear that the Portuguese fleet had indeed begun hostilities against Petapoli or Masulipatam. The danger from the Portuguese was very real, and it was in view of this peril that Matelieff suggested that the ships destined for the Coast should be provided with some small yachts which would hold them over against the Portuguese fusts.

CHAPTER IV.

COROMANDEL II.—BEGINNINGS IN SOUTH COROMANDEL.

THE ARENT AND THE VALK.

Note.—At the time when Ysaacx and Van Wesick suggested the second embassy to Golconda there lay on the Coromandel Coast these two yachts which belonged to the last great fleet that sailed to the East before the passage of the first Governor-General. Leaving Holland in 1607 the fleet came before Goa in the September of the following year. The Admiral despatched the two abovementioned yachts to the Coast to take the cloth that might be there, perhaps also to attend to the fusts that might have departed from Goa for plundering the Coast of Coromandel and thus hinder their plan. They were also to leave a cargo with the senior merchant Pieter Bourgongie at Masulipatam and if need be to leave Jan Van Hounten also there.

By adverse wind De Bitter anchored before Tegnapatam, a place under the authority of the Naik of Gingi. The Governor sent a prow with some goats and chicken on board and came on the following day itself offering ground to the Dutch for building a house. He was also inclined to permit them to build again an old dilapidated Portuguese fort and to trade with his people in all friendship. De Bitter was however anxious to reach Masulipatam before the outbreak of the monsoon. He promised however to inform the Admiral of the offer. On the 18th October 1608 the yachts touched at Cunemor or *Conimor* and on the following day negotiations were carried on. But from here

also they went away quickly because of the fear of the monsoon. Nothing of importance happened to the Dutch at this place.

Previous intimation was sent to Petapoli and thence to Masulipatam of the impending arrival of the yachts so that cargoes might be kept ready. Pieter Ysaacx however wrote that it was a very unsuitable time to ship clothes. 250 packs had been sent on the 3rd June with the *Eendracht* from Masulipatam and as no ships were expected on the coast before March 1609 they had not hastened to pay for the small cargoes. Also no cloth was ready in Petapoli and could not be expected for a long time. In Masulipatam De Bitter left behind 100,000 reals. At Petapoli cargoes were furnished for 8,000 reals. Hans Marcelis who up to this time was there was to go with Pieter Gerritsz Bourgonje who was appointed by the Council of Masulipatam and that of the ships to reside in Tegnapatam. They took with them a cargo of 20 packs linen and 7 packs cotton yarn from Masulipatam, further from Petapoli two packs with 'Sarasse.' A month later 60 or 70 packs of linen more which were not now ready would have been available at Masulipatam.

In view of the difficulties, humiliations and disappointments on the Golconda Coast, the Dutch leaders there were jubilant at the thought of being able to effect settlements in the South Coromandel. Owing to the sleepy trade of the Portuguese they could here without any trouble secure alike for Javanese or Malay requirements the cloth which the inhabitants had for long years been accustomed to make.

A day after the departure of the ships from Petapoli they took as prize a Portuguese ship coming from Arakan or Pegu. It contained merchandise to the value of 12,000 pagodas. On the 19th November De Bitter came with his companions on the road of Tegnapatam where the weightiest portion of his labour on the coast was to be established. The new factory that De Bitter was to establish for the country made the Dutch trade in Coromandel depend in much less measure on the kindness of the native nobles in Golconda.

The Establishment of the Factory at Tegnapatam.

As noted above, the unreasonableness of the Governors and Sabandhars of Masulipatam and Petapoli (who would allow no free trade there but wanted all to trade with them had induced the Dutch to look favourably upon the overtures of the Governor of Tegnapatam who was an enemy of the Portuguese. It was also known that large quantities of linen were made there. The *Arent* and the *Valck* came on the 19th November 1608 before the harbour of Tegnapatam. Immediately after their arrival Pieter Gerritsz Bourgonjie with yet three others went to the capital Ginji, to secure a Caul from the Naik. He reached his destination on the 26th November. The Dutch were well entertained at the capital. The Naik showed great joy over the arrival of the Dutch and offered them besides the decayed Portuguese fort the place Tegnapatam itself. The Dutch did not wish to accept this offer but requested that the Naik would take them under his protection—a proof that they could not yet claim themselves to be particularly powerful and independent. They were fortunate enough to secure a Caul with

which they departed from Ginji on the 30th November. The Caul ran as follows :—

'We promise to Jacob de Bitter, Captain, on behalf of the Admiral Pieter Willemsen Verhoven, to take under our protection the Dutchmen who shall remain in Tegnapatam, and to let build the town, to deny the Portuguese and remain their enemies. Against this, we Dutchmen promise to bring all merchandise and to trade with all merchants and that we shall pay 4 per cent for all the goods that we shall bring here except the rice used in the house, and the money on that shall not be paid. We shall also pay 4 per cent on the goods that we take from there except that on what has once been paid, a further payment will not be made. What has been written above, we promise and swear to guard without breaking in any way. Amen. 30th November 1608 in the great town of Gingee.'

2. Ten Dutchmen were left behind at the factory of Tegnapatam so that if it were possible they might offer some wares. The head of the factory was Bourgonjie who was originally destined for the same office in Masulipatam.[1] Having no understanding of the linen and not being master of the language of the land, he got as his second Hans Marcelis. Only by threats that by refusing he would fall into disgrace with the Directors and with the assurance that he would be released as soon as the ships came could De Bitter and Pieter Ysaacx get Marcelis agree to this. They that came to the coast with the fleet of Verhoff were taken for three or four years likewise, probably because such a difficult business required a certain continuity. De Bitter left behind 12,000 reals in Tegnapatam, also a certain quantity of sandalwood and probably some other wares also. On the 13th December about 12 noon he left taking with him three or four hundred pieces of cloth. Like Luccas Janssen and Dirk Van Leeuwen in the voyage of the *Eendracht* the foremost persons on these yachts, they that stood highest in rank, the commander Jacob de Bitter included, could not refrain from allowing a smuggling trade in clothes.

3. Much was expected of the trade in Tegnapatam. Bourgonjie writes to Verhoff that it would be desirable as speedily as possible to send a ship or yacht to the coast with more cargo, that he should further, spend three or four thousand reals of eight for the building up of the castle. Sandalwood and camphor appear to have been greatly in demand and apparently also cloves, nutmegs, mace,

[1] A particular feature of his administration is that he for himself brought 5,400 measures of ground for only 550 pagodas. If this was the first, it certainly was not the last occasion on which a servant of the Company enriched himself Macleod : *De Oost Indische Compagnie als Zee mogenteld in Azie*, vol. i., p. 95. Hans Marcelis bought at the back door of the lodge cloth that was brought for the Company. *Ibid*, page 92.

green velvet, porcelain, ' armosignen ', red scarlet and yellow copper.

4. After the departure of De Bitter came Bourgonjie with his company on the 1st of January 1609 into the dilapidated castle of Tegnapatam. In this however they could not stay before the new one was built and so the Dutch already on the request of the Governor of the place and according to the command of ' the great Aya ' (an eunuch who had more influence in the land than the Naik and in whom the government consisted) proceeded half a mile inland to a small castle, called Tirupapuliyur[1] a large beautiful stone house made of blue north stone where they should remain for the present.[1] Coolies, lime-burners and stone dressers were set at work for the use of the Dutch in repairing the castle of Tegnapatam. Already on the 3rd of January came, however, the Aya of Ginji who lent coolies to help in the irrigation. They remained longer than they were expected to remain. Weavers and dyers who came into the lodge declared that the Dutch sat there virtually as prisoners. This was still worse, and the Aya had to be visited that the Dutch might make a complaint. The Aya promised to send his eldest brother who would promote the work of the castle as he provided the land with water. At the same time he gave a written assurance that all the weavers, dyers and merchants of all places along the whole coast up to Masulipatam could carry on trade with the Dutch free, and that no toll would be taken from them. The Dutch sent copies of the letter to all places about Tirupapuliyur whereby indeed some dyers and weavers came in the lodge and the regular trade thus got a beginning. The building of the fort of Tegnapatam did not progress. When the Aya was spoken to, he began to persuade them to put it off till the arrival of their next fleet. He said that without ammunition the Dutch would not be able to defend it against the Portuguese. Further the building of a fort was a hazardous undertaking. The Portuguese would go and complain to the ' great king ' (of Karnataka) and he would see with an envious eye the Dutch fort springing up. If he heard of the Dutch only as merchants he would not mind. However the Dutch were free to begin their trade at Tirupapuliyur and in November 1610 Hermite even thought the place more suitable than Tegnapatam itself that was but a waste place.

[1] The lodge is described in Macleod, vol. i, p. 92 : ' The house or lodge is of blue free stone. There were 100 beautiful pillars, prettily and very beautifully covered with figures and other things. It was 105 feet long and 75 feet broad. The goods were well protected, for the lodge was all made of blue free stone, under and above everything except the doors. A very beautiful and splendid building. For greater security, in front of the fortress were placed three iron guns and a half frame cannon '.

5. From this new place also, they had prematurely to break up, and that by their own fault. An unexpected wantonness imperilled the respect shown to the factors. So the continued existence of the lodge was seriously endangered and the officers of the factories in Golconda were filled with indignation because there was so little of robust discretion in the South.[1] Bourgonjie was forced to ask the local authority to take the insurgents prisoners. They were shut up in a place apart so that they could cause no trouble to the people. Bourgonjie thus showed how little authority he was able to exercise. Further the temporary reduction of personnel must have very unfavourably reacted on the trade. On the 10th June, the prisoners were released evidently at the request of the 'Great Aya'. With wonderment and indignation had the factory keepers in the factories of Golconda taken note of these evil deeds. Van Wesick feared that by that bad government or by the obstinate wantonness of the delinquents, the Dutch might perhaps have to leave the entire coast. He condemned also the discretion of Bourgonjie. The drunken could have been left alone when they became sober. He felt that the Company should know what damage could be done to them by bad rulers.

6. **Reverses.**—Although it was easier for the Dutch to fight the Portuguese in the South Coromandel between St. Thome and Negapatam than in the north as the great Aya helped them to remain there against the king's wishes by getting over the Naik on his side, nevertheless some reverses were in store for them. The Portuguese it is true did not succeed in driving the Dutch from Tirupapuliyur. But the latter had to behold with envious eyes that their enemies, for 1,500 pardans, secured from the Naik Tegnapatam and still seven other villages, however much the Dutch might promise from the beginning that they would give double of what the Portuguese might offer. It was all the doing of the Aya. Also, it was hard lines that the Portuguese utilised for the building of the fort at Tegnapatam, the materials which the Dutch had got ready. For the Dutch, the position was so disagreeable and uncertain, that the trade was under grief. No dyer or weaver was allowed to approach the Dutch factory without the permission of the Governor and when they had

[1] The chief instigator in this was Cornelis Jacobs left by De Bitter as third at the factory of Tegnapatam. He left the lodge with three others on the 15th February. The four came back to the lodge in a far from sober condition. Bourgonjie commanded them to go into confinement which they simply refused to do. They said that justice would be done to them when the next ship arrived and resorted to all manner of antics, rushing up to the roof of the house and climbing over the wall of the fort. The Governors of Tegnapatam and Tirupapuliyur being present, the credit of Bourgonjie for enforcing authority was at a low ebb. As true amok runners the four went about with naked rapiers spreading terror and dismay round about.

weapons with them, they had to leave them behind at the doorway. Meanwhile the Portuguese built their houses near the walls of the fort at Tegnapatam so that the same had only to be filled with earth to serve as bulwark. A Portuguese Jesuit intrigued at the court of Gingi. The great hatred of the Portuguese was manifest. They even suggested to a barber that he might use poisoned instruments when bleeding the Dutch, kill two or three, and then escape to San Thome or Negapatam.

7. Soon there came a turn for the good. Already in September 1609 Bourgonjie wrote to the north that the rumour went that the Portuguese would be leaving Tegnapatam, and thus the trade began already to revive. And the rumour came true. But there was an interval. On the 4th December the Portuguese were driven by the Naik and the Aya for not having kept their promises to the Naik of Gingi. They were thrust out as if they had been hounds, but the Dutch had to be free with promises, of gold to both. Bourgonjie was not however overhasty to turn back again to Tegnapatam. In May 1610 Bourgonjie wrote that though it was true that more profit could be secured at Tegnapatam than in Tirupapuliyur yet they must see for an year or two how the trade would be.

8. To reward the Naik for the goodness that he had shown by the expulsion of the Portuguese, the following plan was formed. They knew that he was a great lover of elephants. Therefore a donation was sent to the King of Kandy that two or three elephants might be secured. This led to the desired result, for in May Bourgonjie had the news that three elephants were on the way and would reach Tirupapuliyur within 20 days.

9. Besides the presents the Dutch had promised to cause help to reach the King of Kandy. He was in difficulties with the Portuguese and had repeatedly asked for help. From Tegnapatam Jacob De Bitter had already sent a letter with a certain Montinaik, merchant of the Naik of Gingi to Bemedela Sondian, King of Kandy wherein he declared to his regret that he had no more time to devote to the request he had received for help, but the prospects were that he could speedily make a small treaty. Later the King of Kandy sent to the factors at Tirupapuliyur by envoys a golden ring with five blue stones and five sacks of cinnamon. They offered on behalf of the king to present annually to the Dutch 10 or 12 elephants to satisfy this Naik and he promised that he would permit no Portuguese to remain in his land. He therefore humbly requested help against his enemies.

Similar supplications for help from the Dutch of South Coromandel against the Portuguese were made by the rulers of *Jaffnapatam* and *Cochin* and the Naiks of Tanjore. Bourgonji and his officers resolved to request of him the place *Trimelipatam* situated between

Tirupapuliyur and Negapatam that was particularly suitable for leaving some people when a ship came there. With that aim, a letter was written to which up to 7th April 1609 no reply was received.

ADVANTAGES OF TIRUPAPULIYUR

Tirupapuliyur thus appeared to be a suitable point for the carrying on of negotiations elsewhere. The convenience for the cloth trade was also favourable. When the Dutch began their trade here in earnest they had about 30 dyers at work in the lodge and the prices they paid were of such a nature that Borgonjie thought that it was not necessary to deal so much with Godia Soheyder in painted cloth. Indigo was also to be acquired there at equitable prices. Borgonjie requested Pieter Ysaacx to send samples of Malay and Javanese cloth, also of those which could not be made in the north as this probably could succeed at Tirupapuliyur. Till May 1610 Pieter Ysaacx did not fulfil this request. They had already tried to order cloth from Pulicat at the new factory, but this had great difficulties as the Portuguese could delay the wares at San Thome which was situated between the two places. This trade was not strictly necessary, and it seemed that if no sudden disturbance again took place the trade at Tirupapuliyur would flourish very well.

RELATION OF TIRUPAPULIYUR WITH THE OTHER FACTORIES

Was Borgonjie like Van Wesick subordinate to Pieter Ysaacx, or did he stand under both the other factors or was he absolutely independent, so far to the south of both the other factories ? The last was at any rate in practice certainly the case. It would also have been strange if Borgonjie who originally was destined to take the place of Pieter Ysaacx should now be placed under him. Men in the north did not think that Borgonjie displayed much judgment in the matter of the outrage of Cornelis Jacobs. They did not therefore consider the factories in the south Coromandel by any means as a foundation where they should meddle. Van Wesick laments over the arbitrariness of Borgonjie who felt so absolutely independent of North Coromandel. It was a release for the Company when finally in 1610 a new arrangement of firm organisation was effected, bringing all the factories on the Coast under one direction so that no private question could again rise.

(*To be continued.*).

SOME ASPECTS OF THE VĀYU PURĀṆA

MR. V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR, M.A.
Lecturer in Indian History, University of Madras.

SECTION I

THE NAME

The scene of this Purāṇa, considered to be one of the earliest of the extant Purāṇas, is laid in the Naimiṣāraṇya where sages and learned Brahmans assembled in connection with the sacrifice (*yajña*) of King Ạdhisīmakṛṣṇa. It appears that Vāyu, the wind god, originally communicated it to the assembled sages. This was then learnt by Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa who in his turn taught it to Lomaharṣana, the Sūta. Ugraśravas, his son, repeats the same to the holy men at the Naimiṣāraṇya. There is internal evidence of the fact that Vāyu was the original author, for now and then, occurs the phrase *Vāyuruvāca*, and questions are put to him by the sages.[1] No doubt Vāyu is as much a mythical figure as Vyāsa. Neither seems to be genuine authors though orthodox tradition bears testimony to this. Nor even Lomaharṣaṇa or his son Ugraśravas seems to be the real author. All of them seem to have been the transmitters of tradition from time to time. At the least the Purāṇa itself accepts change of thirty-one hands from Brahma to the Sūta.[2] Examining critically the materials of the extant Purāṇa, it is reasonable to assume that there were many redactors who made either additions or omissions according to the dictates of their fancy. Notwithstanding these transformations, much of the material of which the Purāṇa is composed, is old, genuine, and acceptable for historical purposes.[3]

SECTION II

ITS PLACE IN THE MAHĀ-PURĀṆAS

We know it as a matter of fact that every Purāṇa furnishes us with a list of the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas so called. But all such lists are not identical but slightly vary from one another. For example,

[1] See, for example, chapters 100 and 101.
[2] Ch. 102, sl. 58–66.
[3] See Pargiter, *Dynasties of Kali Age* and *An. Ind. Historical Tradition*, pp. 77–81.

the *Vāyu Purāṇa* is omitted in the list of some Purāṇas, though others include it in their lists. The *Padma Purāṇa*, the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* do not include the *Vāyu Purāṇa* in their catalogue of the Mahā-purāṇas. The position with regard to other Purāṇas may be thus explained. The *Agni Purāṇa* and the *Matsya Purāṇa* omit the *Śiva Purāṇa* and substitute the *Vāyu Purāṇa* in its place. The *Kūrma Purāṇa* does not mention the *Agni Purāṇa* and inserts the *Vāyu Purāṇa* instead. The *Vārāha Purāṇa* again omits the *Garuḍa* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* and substitutes the *Vāyu* and the *Nārasimha* in their places. Excepting these four Purāṇas, the lists in the other Purāṇas do not fail to include the *Vāyu Purāṇa* and therefore the majority of the Purāṇas agree that the *Vāyu Purāṇa* is a *Maha-purāṇa*, and not an *upapurāṇa* as some would have it.

Sometimes the *Vāyu Purāṇa* is identified with the *Śiva Purāṇa* and sometimes with the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa.*[1] It may be, however noted here that the Tamil tradition as narrated in the *Piṅgalandai* omits the *Vāyu* from the list and includes the *Śiva Purāṇa* to form the total number of eighteen.[2] As many as six purāṇas have also the name of the *Śiva Purāṇa* in their lists. In his commentary on the *Mitākṣara*, Bālambhaṭṭa proceeds to identify the *Śiva Purāṇa* with the *Vāyu Puraṇa.* It appears that, on a closer examination of the contents of both the Purāṇas, the theory that both the *Vāyu* and the *Śiva Purāṇas* are identical, may not hold good. The apparent confusion may be due to the *Vāyavīya saṁhitā* tacked on to the end of the extant *Śiva Purāṇa.* The *Vāyavīya saṁhitā* is in its turn divided into two parts, the *pūrva bhāga* of 35 chapters and the *uttara bhāga* of 41 chapters. These occupy the seventh book of the *Śiva Purāṇa* and this seems to have been taken for the *Vāyu Purāṇa* and consequently the *Vāyu Purāṇa* has been removed from the lists of some Purāṇas, the *Śiva* or some other Purāṇa being inserted in its place. An examination again of the *Vāyavīya saṁhitā* section of the *Śiva Purāṇa* with the extant *Vāyu Purāṇa* does not show any correspondence either in texts or contents. If the present *Vāyu Purāṇa* cannot be identified either with the *Śiva Purāṇa* as a whole or with the *Vāyavīya saṁhitā* of the *Śiva Purāṇa*, then, it is reasonable to assume that the *Vayu Purāṇa* is an independent Purāṇa and has no connection whatsoever with the *Śiva Purāṇa* or its last section.

The suggestion has been made that this Purāṇa and the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*, were originally one *Purāṇa* and later on became separated into two independent Purāṇas.[3] No doubt, passages agree *verbatim*

[1] The *Vāyu Purāṇa*, Bib. Ind. II. Preface by Rajendralal Mitra, 1888.
[2] See my paper on the *Purāṇas : A Study.*
[3] Pargiter, *An. Ind. Hist. Trad.*, pp. 77–8.

in both the Purāṇas ; but it is more reasonable to conjecture that one is indebted to the other by borrowing passages from many a section. Now that the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* occurs in the lists of all the eighteen Purāṇas and the *Vāyu Purāṇa* is omitted in some, it may be inferred that the *Vāyu Purāṇa* was composed later than the *Brahmāṇḍa* and that the *Vāyu Purāṇa* was indebted to it, though both come under the category of the oldest Purāṇas now available.

Then the question is whether the *Vāyu Purāṇa* is a *Mahā-purāṇa* or not. That it is a *Maha-purāṇa* is testified to us by more than one evidence. First, the matter and manner of style demonstrate that it is the oldest of the Purāṇas now existing. But more of this later on. Secondly, the majority of the *Maha-purāṇas* include it in their lists.

Thirdly, it answers to the description of a *Mahā-purāṇa* as given by the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.

SECTION III

CLASSIFICATION OF ITS CONTENTS

The version of the *Matsya Purāṇa* which is considered to be old, contains a significant statement with the implication that the *Vāyu Purāṇa* is a composition of the *Śveta Kalpa* (the present Kalpa is so called by the Hindu astronomers) and that it is 24,000 stanzas in extent.[1]

An examination of the extant Purāṇa, both the MSS. and the published editions, shows its range from 10,714 to 12,000 ślokas.[2] Either the statement of the *Matsya Purāṇa* is wrong or the present Purāṇa is defective. We venture to accept the latter view in the face of an internal evidence wherein the Purāṇa claims 23,000 stanzas.[3] It appears that the original *Vāyu Purāṇa* which was in extent 23,000 ślokas got a further addition of a thousand ślokas by the time of the *Matsya Purāṇa* and gradually portions of it became lost until at last it was reduced to half its size, the extent of the extant Purāṇa. When one reads through the whole, one feels a break in its continuity, omission

[1] श्वेतकल्पप्रसङ्गेन धर्मान्वायुरिहाब्रवीत् ।
यत्रैतद्वायवीयं यस्याद्रुद्रमाहात्म्यसंयुतं
चतुर्विंशत्सहस्राणि पुराणं तदिहोच्यते ॥

[2] See the Preface of Rajendralal Mitra to his edition of the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, Bibliotheca Indica.

[3] See ch. 103, st. 7.

त्रयोविंशति साहस्रमनिलं तद्भुतं शुभम् ।

of several passages, repetition of many stanzas and lastly misplacement of several names and verses. These features show that the Purāṇa has been meddled with to a considerable extent and even in the extant volume, if one begins to set aside the later interpolations like the glorification of Gayā, the sacred place of pilgrimage, what remains will be roughly one-fourth of the original purāṇa, which is, however, ancient and genuine.

According to the catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Library of the India Office (Pt. v., ed. by Julius Eggeling 1896), there are a good number of *māhātmyas* which profess to be part of the *Vāyu Purāṇa.* These are:

1. *Narmadā-māhātmya* which is in praise of the sacred river Narmadā.

2. *Māgha-māhātmya*, a section of 30 chapters (separately published in Poona, 1878) treating of the importance in detail of the effect of *māgha-snānam* or the ceremony of ablutions in the month of *Māgha*, illustrated by a series of legends.

3. *Ānandakānana-māhātmya* (*rahasya*)—also called *Kāsi-māhātmya* professing to be a section of the *Lakshmī-saṁhitā* of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* wherein the Vaiṣṇava creed finds strong expression.

4. *Gosthāna-māhātmya* in five chapters treating of legends on the origin of a group of sacred pools near Śrinagara, comprised under the name of Gosthāni.

5. *Pāpaghnī-māhātmya* containing a legendary account of the river Pāpaghnī; and

6. *Rājagṛha-māhātmya* treating of the legendary origin of Rājagṛha, the ancient capital of Magadha.

7. The *māhātmya* of Karvan or Kāyāvarohaṇa, is of special interest to us in that, that out of its four chapters, the first chapter ends thus : '*Iti Śri Vāyupurāṇe Śivaprasūti-sargaḥ.*' The other three chapters are attributed to *Śiva Purāṇa* with which we are not at present concerned.

The mention of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* in the colophon of the first chapter of the *Māhātmya* is an instance of the fathering of modern compilations on an ancient work. Either in the extant editions or the manuscript copies which go under the name of the *Vāyu Purāṇa,* we do not have a special chapter or section entitled *Śivaprasūti sargaḥ.* It is not impossible, however, that such a chapter was in the original Purāṇa, as the latter speaks of the different incarnations of Śiva, of which Lakulīśa is one.[1] There is no denying the fact that these *māhātmyas* or glorifications of certain centres of pilgrimage are much later compositions, and cannot go in as the old material of the

[1] *Ar. Sur. of India, An. R. 1906-7,* p. 180.

Purāṇa. In order to give credence to these smaller works, their authors have ingeniously tacked them on to a Mahā-purāṇa, so that they might claim more attention from the public. Fortunately for us the editors of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* both in Bengal and Bombay have not included these *māhātmyas* which are ascribed to the Purāṇa. It would have been again better if the editors had stopped with chapter 41 of the second kāṇḍa. The *Vāyu Purāṇa* proper certainly ends with it. The chapter commencing with *Vyāsasaṃśayāpanodanam*[1] and the following eight chapters are clear interpolations.

The opening chapter of the Purāṇa is typical of its kind. It was the reign of king Adhisīmakṛṣṇa, a king of the Paurava dynasty, who lived long before the Kali Age. At this time the sages were engaged in their twelve-year sacrifice on the bank of the river Dṛṣadvatī in the Naimiṣa forest, the legendary origin of which is also described. In the course of this sacrifice, there appears on the scene the Sūta Paurāṇika and on the request of the sages assembled the Sūta narrates to them the *Vāyu Purāṇa* as it was heard by him. The prologue of this kind has its own value. First it carries us back to the age of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Atharvaveda*, where many of the predecessors of the reigning king Adhisīmakṛṣṇa are mentioned.[2] Secondly, it furnishes us with a succinct account of the contents of the whole work. The opening chapters of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* seem to give us three indexes of which the first two are neither precise nor in order. They have no correspondence with the contents of the work. We are however on surer ground when we come to the third index which is fairly full and which almost coincides with the contents of the Purāṇa. Though the whole of it presents an unsystematic and ill-arranged method still it enables us to find out what contents of the Purāṇa have been omitted, lost or added. As a table of contents, the introductory portions are indeed valuable to a student of history. In this respect it compares favourably with the prefatory chapters of the two epics, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*.

Coming then to an examination of the contents of the Purāṇa we find at the outset that the whole of the Purāṇa is divided into two kāṇḍas[3], besides the peculiar classification of four *pādas* or sections, the *Prakriya pāda*, the *Anuṣaṅga pāda*, the *Upodghāta pāda* and the *Upasaṁhāra pāda*.

It is peculiar in the sense that other Purāṇas excepting the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* do not go under this classification. Leaving out the two opening chapters, the *Prakrīya Pāda* occupies only four

[1] Chapter 103 of the Ānandaśrama edition.
[2] C. H. I., Vol. I., p. 302.
[3] The second kāṇḍa begins with the 62nd chapter.

chapters, with the general title of *Sṛṣṭiprakaraṇam* or the creation of the world.

The second section entitled the *Anuṣaṅga Pāda* is the longest of the four sections and comprises 58 chapters of the book,—beginning with the 7th chapter and ending with the 64th chapter. The following are the titles of the important chapters—creation of gods and men, cycles of Manus, practice of yoga, a description of thirty-three *kalpas* or fixed epochs of the duration of the world, the last of which is the *Śvēta* or white *kalpa* in which we are now said to live. Incarnation of Mahādeva, and the curse of Dakṣa, descendants of Ṛṣis, of Agni and other devas, of Svāyambhuva Manu, of Prajāpati and of Pṛthu are also some of the chief topics. Others are a description of the *Jambūdvīpa*, of the four *yugas*, of the sacred *tīrthas* including mountains, rivers, pools, temples, the region of *pitris*, and of the continents of Ketumāla, Bhāratavarṣa, Kimpuruṣa, and Plakṣa. Lastly may be noted the hymn to Nīlakaṇṭha (the blue-necked Śiva) and the Liṅgam (phallus).

The *Upodghāta* section consists of 34 chapters (65–98) and relates among other things the following: a description of the races of Prajāpati, of Kāśyapa, of Varuṇa, of Vaivasvata Manu, of Viṣṇu, and of the Gandharvas. Also we have an account of the Śrāddhas to which more than 10 chapters are devoted, of the descendants of Soma and of the Yadu race, and lastly, the dynasties of the Kali Age.

The last section entitled the *Upasaṁhāra Pāda* contains thirteen chapters where the periods of seven Manus, past and future, are given in detail. Besides a description of celestial regions, periodical destructions and regenerations are explained. The concluding chapters on the greatness of Gayā seem to be out of place and indicate a definite interpolation. Practically speaking the *Upasaṁhāra pāda* consists of only four chapters. According to its own version these four pādas or sections are said to contain 4,800, 3,600, 2,400 and 1,200 ślokas respectively, giving a total of 12,000 ślokas which roughly agrees with the extant editions. The six chapters forming the *Prakrīya pāda* of the published work constitute only 498 ślokas, the chapters of the *Anuṣaṅgapāda* contain 4,868 ślokas, of the *Upasaṁhāra* 1,477 verses and all altogether 10,991 verses, excluding the half-verses, colophons to chapters etc. There is then an apparent contradiction between the actual texts and that which could be gathered from internal evidence.[1]

A perusal of the contents gives us the following results. This Purāṇa has not been much tampered with, like others of its kind. It still contains original and valuable materials. It gives us the

[1] See Chapter 32.

geographical distribution of the world as known to the ancients. It is in a way an historical treatise giving the genealogy of not only gods, patriarchs and sages, but also of the kings of the lunar and solar races with their different branches. The section on the dynasties of the Kali Age shows that portion or the whole of it was revised sometime after the commencement of the Gupta era. It keeps the invariable form of the Purāṇas and the Itihāsas which is a dialogue started by one person making enquiries after things and answered by one who could speak with authority on the subject, that is, one well trained in traditional lore.

SECTION IV

LITERATURE KNOWN TO THE PURĀṆA

Notwithstanding the curious statement in the *Vāyu Purāṇa* that the Purāṇas as a class preceded the Vedas, we have indications in every chapter how this Purāṇa was indebted to the older Vedic literature from which it has freely drawn, and of which it makes no secret. For the term *iti śrutiḥi* occurs pretty frequently indicating that to be the opinion of the *śruti* or the Veda. There are sometimes *verbatim* citations as we shall see presently. The fact that the extant Purāṇa was revised in the epoch of the Guptas, gives the indication of the Purāṇa spreading over a number of centuries. In such a work interpolations are not unnatural and consequently we need not be amazed at references to post-Purāṇa literature also. From omissions and transpositions, from repetitions of the same śloka or account, one has to infer that the work has not been handled with the care that it deserves by the later redactors.[1] For example, a brief account of Vaiśāli dynasty occurs in chapter 70–23 ff; and also chapter 86, 3 ff.

Commencing with the Vedic literature, the Purāṇa seems to be familiar with the three great divisions of the Veda;—Saṁhitā, Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣad.[2]

It also knows the Vedāṅgas. It does not however mention the name of any Brāhmaṇa or the Upaniṣad [3] but refers to Mantra, Brāhmaṇa and Kalpasūtra.[4] The term Āraṇyaka is mentioned in more than one place. It discusses at length in chapter 61 and elsewhere (chapter 104) how there was originally one Veda which the

[1] For repetitions of verses etc., see ch. 4, 51–60 and also ibid. 64–68: ch. 7, 29 and 50: also ibid 61 and 70. ch. 8, 4 and 6–7: ch. 6, 28–33 and ch. 8, 8-13. ch. 8, 19–20 and ch. 6, 45–46. etc.

[2] Chap. 1–200; 6.22.

[3] Chap. 20, st. 25; ch. 30, ch. 231.

[4] Chap. 58, st. 12-13. Ch. 30, 231; also chap. 6, 54 and 102.

Creator first revealed, and then points out the reasons for successive editions of the Vedas. Kalpa succeeding Kalpa, the sages 8,800 in number [1] were deputed to edit the Saṁhitās, and they are known by the significant term Mantrabrāhmaṇa kartāraḥ.[2] In chapter 104 the story is given how Vyāsa, unable to understand the intricacies of the Vedic texts, performed severe austerities when he got the divine light to collate and edit the four Vedas. This is in keeping with the statement in an earlier chapter [3] Vyāsa was assisted by four pupils Jaimini, Sumantu, Vaiśampāyana and Paila for the Sāma, Atharva, Yajus and Rig Vedas respectively. It is added that a fifth pupil of Vyāsa, Lomaharṣaṇa, was deputed to rearrange the *Itihāsa-purāṇa*. It would appear that the original Veda consisted of 100,000 *saṁhitās* which increased tenfold in course of time.[4] It is further said that the Yajus Saṁhitā was divided into four parts.[5] In this connection Taittirīya is mentioned (66). The Rig Veda was first divided into two parts. The editor of the second part Bāṣkali analysed it into four divisions or *śākhaṣ*, which were entrusted to Bodnya, Agnimāṭhara, Parāśara and Yājñavalkya. The editor of the first part was Indrapramti who taught it to the sage Mārkaṇḍeya.[6] Other *śākha-pravartakas* are Sākalya, Rathantara and Bharadvāja.[7] Of these Sākalya is said to be compiler of 5 *saṁhitās*[8]. Nirukta is mentioned and its authorship is attributed to one Rathītara.[9] The

[1] On this number see, Āp. Dh. II, 9, 23, 3–5; Yāj. III, 186.
[2] Chap. 61, 120–24.

[5] व्यस्यते ह्येकविद्यं तद्द्वापरेषु पुनः पुनः ।
ब्रह्मा चैतदुवाचाऽदौ तस्मिन्वैवस्वतेऽन्तरे ॥
आवर्तमाना ऋषयो युगाख्यासु पुनः पुनः ।
कुर्वन्ति संहिता ह्येते जायमानाः परस्परम् ।
अष्टाशीति सहस्राणि श्रुतर्षीणां स्मृतानि वै ।
ता एव संहिता ह्येते आवर्तन्ते पुनः पुनः ॥
'श्रितादक्षिणपन्थानं ये श्मशानानि भेजिरे ।
युगे युगे तु ताः शाखा व्यस्यन्ते तैः पुनः पुनः ॥
द्वावरेष्विह सर्वेषु संहिताश्च श्रुतर्षिभिः ।
तेषां गोत्रेष्विमाः शाखा भवन्तीह पुनः पुनः ॥
ताः शाखास्तत्र कर्तारो भवन्तीह युगक्षयात् ॥

[3] 60, 11 f.
[4] *Ibid.* 7.
[5] *Ibid.* 7.
[6] *Ibid.* 24-27.
[7] *Ibid.* 32.
[8] *Ibid.* 63.
[9] Ch. 60-65 and 61-2.

Purāṇa proceeds to mention categorically the *padas* or *Saṃhitās* of these Vedic works. But as it stands the numerical analysis is quite unintelligible.

Rig Veda	...	8,600
Sāma Veda	...	8,014
Yajur Veda	...	12,000
Atharva Veda	...	...
Vājasaneyaka	...	2,200
Caraṇavidyā	...	6,026

The Purāṇa also accounts for the differences in *śākhas*.[1] Though the latter half of the Chapter (61) accounts for the necessity of different editions of the Vedas, the first half of the chapter is itself a treatise on Vedic literature.

Among the *Aṅgas* of the Vedas figure Mīmāmsā, Nyāya (Hetuśāstra), Dharmaśāstra, (Smṛtiśāstra), Purāṇa, Āyurveda, Dhanurveda, Gāndharva śāstra, and Arthaśāstra.[2] In an earlier chapter (58) Jyotiṣa as an *aṅga* is mentioned.[3] Āyur Veda which is attributed to Dhanvantari is said to be edited by Bharadvāja into eight parts which were imparted to his pupils.[4] The term Dharmaśāstra occurs in other places but no name is mentioned.[5] In a verse 109 of chapter 66 the expression is followed by an attribute *Purātane* which suggests that there were older Dharmaśāstras which have been lost beyond redemption. This corroborates the view of the late Bühler who held that there was an older *Mānavadharmaśāstra* which is lost to us. No details of Dhanur Veda are given though the term occurs in more than one place.[6] The Purāṇa has interesting details about Gāndharvam or science of music.[7] The name of the author is not given and the Purāṇa simply states that it speaks on the authority of ancient teachers on music.[8]

Other literature known to the Purāṇa are Vyākaraṇa and Bhāṣya.[9] There is only one reference to Vyākaraṇa in the whole Purāṇa, and we have to assume it must be a reference to Pāṇini's work. Equally rare is the use of Bhāṣya. In one place we hear of Bhāṣyavid[10] and from the circumstance in which this term Bhāṣyavid occurs in chapter 82.52 it can be conjectured that it refers to the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. This is not improbable especially when a compiler's hand was

[1] Chapter 61, 7-9 and 73-77, Chapter 58, 12-13.
[2] *Ibid.* 78-79 ; also see chapter 58, 23-24.
[3] See also 66, 52.
[4] Chapter 92, 21-22.
[5] Chapter 1, 61 ; 66-109 ; 83-53.
[6] Chapter 30, 36 and 99, 202.
[7] Chapter 86-35 f. the whole of Chapter 87.
[8] Chapter 87. 1. For details see below a special section on this subject.
[9] Chapter 82, 52. [10] Chapter 61. 103.

at work in the Gupta period. Though the Purāṇa is a regular treatise on the Śrāddha and other ceremonies connected with the Pitris, and though as many as fifteen chapters deal with it, it is a matter for surprise that the Purāṇa does not mention any *Gṛhya sūtra* by name. But it appears that the injunctions laid down in this Purāṇa with regard to technicalities and the details of the Śrāddha more or less correspond with those in the *Āsvalāyanā-gṛhyasūtra.*

In this connection mention may be made of a list of persons fit to be invited for Śrāddha purposes. What Prof. Hopkins has observed of the didactic epic is equally applicable to the *Vāyu Purāṇa.* In furnishing the list it 'adds elements to the simpler statement of the earlier law-books'. What is interesting is that the same passages almost *verbatim* are found in the *Mahābhārata,*[1] and the *Vāyu Purāṇa.*[2] The list speaks of *Pāṅkteyas* or those who are worthy of sitting and eating in the same row. These are (i) those who have studied all Vedas, and practised austerities, (ii) expounders of Bhāṣya, (iii) of Vyākaraṇa, (iv) of Purāṇa, (v) of Dharmaśāstra, (vi) Triṇāciketu, (vii) Pañcāgni, (viii) Trisuparṇa, (ix) Saḍaṅgvid or one with knowlege of six *aṅgas.* (x) Sons of Brahmadeya, (xi) Chandogas, (xii) Jyeṣṭasāmagas, (xiii) those who have bathed in holy waters, (xiv) bathed in *avabhṛtas* of Yajñas, (xv) those who are addicted to truth and *svadharma,* (xvi) those who are not angry, (xvii) those who practise *śānti* or peace. Then it proceeds to give a list of *apāṅkteyas* or those unworthy to be invited.[3] It can be doubted whether these passages are not altogether later interpolations.

Vedic Citations in the Purāṇa

So far, we have been noticing generally the literary documents known to the Purāṇa. It has been seen that the Purāṇa is familiar with the four Vedas, the Upavedas, and the Upāṅgas. Let us now examine some of the passages which are either copies of the Vedic texts or imitations in an amended or emended form.

Rig Veda I. i. 1
 Agni Mīḷe Purohitam

Vāyu P. Chapter 26. 17
 ṛgvedam prathamam tasya tvagnimīḷe purohitam

Samaveda I. 1. cf. Ṛg. Veda 6.16.10
 agni āyāhi vitaye gṛṇāno havya dātaye

[1] XIII. 90. 26-36.
[2] Chapter 82, 51–55. *Cf.* Manu (III. 184-5).
[3] *Ibid.* 66 ff.

Vāyu P. the same texts chapter 26.23

Yajurvedasaṃhitā I. 1.

Iṣe tvorje tvā vāyava sthā devo vaḥ savitā

Vāyu P. the same, chapter 26.90

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇam II. 8. 8.61

annam prāṇam annamapānamāhuḥ |
annam mṛtyum tasmu jivātumāhuḥ ||
annam brahmaṇo jarasam vadanti |
annamāhuḥ prajananam prajānam ||

Vāyu P. Chapter 14.15

annam prāṇstathāpānam mṛtyurjivatmeva ca |
annam brahma ca vijñeyam prajānam prasavastatha ||

Taitt. Brāh. I. 4. 10. 57

agnirvāva saṃvatsaraḥ |
ādityaḥ parivatsaraḥ ||
candramā idāvatsaraḥ |
vāyuranuvatsaraḥ ||

Vāyu P. Chapter 31, 29–32

ṛturagnistu yaḥ proktaḥ sa tu samvatsaromatah |
ādityeyastvasau sāraḥ kālagniḥ parivatsaraḥ ||
sa idāvatsaraḥ somaḥ purāṇe niścayo mataḥ |
āsu kartā ca lokasya sa vàyuranuvatsaraḥ ||

Taitt. Brāh. II ii, 41, 22.

sa bhūriti vyāharat sa bhūmimasṛjata | .

Vāyu P. Chapter 101. 18.

bhūriti vyāhṛte pūrvam bhūrlokaśa tato bhavat |

Taitt. Brāh. Ibid.

sa bhuva iti vyāharat |
sontarikṣamasṛjata ||

Vāyu P. 1, 9

dvitīyo bhuvam ityukta antarikṣam tatobhavat |

Taitt Brāh. Ibid. 23

sa suvariti vyāharat |
sa divamasṛjata |

Vāyu P. Ibid.

tṛtiyam svaritītyukte divam prādurbabhūva ha |

Taitt. Brah. III, 12, 9

tapa āsit gṛhapatiḥ | brahma brahmā-bhavatsvayam |
irā patnī viśvasṛjām |
mṛtyustadā bhavaddhātā śamitogno viśāṃ patiḥ |

Vāyu P. Ch. II, 6-7

tapo gṛhapatiryatra brahmā brahmā bhavaḥ svayam |
iḷāya yatra patnītvam śāmitram yatra buddhimān||
mṛtyuścakre mahātejastasmin satre mahātmanām||

Taitt. Brah. II, 7, 10[1]

pañcava ṛtavaḥ saṃvatsaraḥ |
ṛtuṣveva samvatsare pratitiṣṭati||

Vāyu P.

yaccaiva pañcadhātma vai proktaḥ samvatsaro dvijaiḥi||

Taitt. Saṁhitā I, III, 14, 1

tvamagne rudro asuro maho divastvam
śardho mārutam pṛkṣa iśiṣe

Vāyu P. Ch. 22, 71

tvamagne rudro asuromaho divastvam sardho mārutam pṛkṣa iśiṣe.

Upaniṣadic Citations

Māhānārāyaṇopaniṣad : 74

prāṇānam granthirasi rudro māviśantakaḥ.

Vāyu P. Ch. 15.9

prāṇānam granthirasyātma rudro hyātmā viśantakaḥ

Ibid. 12.

ajāmekām lohita śuklakṛṣṇām bahvim prajām janayantim sarūpām
ajo hyeko juṣamāṇonuśete jagātyenām bhuktabhogāmajonyaḥ

Vāyu P. Ch. 20, 28

ajāmekām lohita śukla kṛṣṇām bahvīḥ prajāḥ sṛjamānām sarūpāḥ |
ajo hyeko juṣamāṇonuśete jagātyenām bhukta bhogamajonyaḥ||

Kaṭhopaniṣad

puruṣānna param kimcit sa kāṣṭha sa parāgatiḥ |

Vāyu P. Ch. 104.43

akṣarānna param kimcit sā kāṣṭhā sa parāgatiḥ |

Taittirīya Upa. 3.2

annadhyeva khalvimāni bhūtāni jāyante |
annena jātāni jīvanti |

[1] *Note.*—In the *Taittirīya saṁhitā* the *Rtus* which are also known by the name of *Prayājas* I, VI, XI, 43 are taken as five, though the compiler of the *Saṁhitā* is not unaware of the sixth. Here *Hemanta* and *Śiśira* are taken together. I, VI, ii. 6.

Vāyu P. Ch. 15, 16
vardhante tena bhātāni tasmādannam taducyate||

Taitt. Upaniṣad Ānandavalli
yatovāco nivartante aprāpya manasa saha|

Vāyu Purāṇa. Ch. 103. 10
tasmādvāco nivartante aprāpya manasa saha|

Kenopaniṣad. 2.
śrotrasya śrotram manaso mano
yadvāco ha vācam sa prāṇasya
prāṇaścakṣuścakṣuratimucya dhīrāḥ
pretyāsmāllokādamṛtā bhavanti|

Vāyu P. Ch. 104. 37
yaccakṣuṣām cakṣuratha śrotrāṇām śrotramatyati|
tvakvacām rasānam tasya prāṇam prāṇasya yadviduḥ||

Muṇḍakopaniṣad 2.4
praṇavo dhanuḥ śaro hyātmā brahmā tallakṣyamucyate|
apramattena veddhavyam śaravattanmayo bhavet||

Vāyu P. Ch. 20.5
praṇavo dhanuḥ śaro hyātmā brahmā tallakṣyam uccyate|
apramattena veddhavyam śaravattanmayo bhavet||

Śvetāśvataropaniṣad. 3.16. Cp. *Gītā* 13.13
sarvataḥ pāṇipādam tatsarvatokṣiśiro mukham
sarvataḥ śrutimalloke sarvamāvṛtya tiṣṭhati||

Vāyu P. Ch. 14. 13 also 30. 182
sarvataḥ pāṇipādāntam sarvatokṣiśiromukham|
sarvataḥ śrutimalloke sarvamāvṛtya tiṣṭhati||

Other Citations

Bhagavad Gītā VI. 19
yathā dīpo nivātastho neṅgate sopamā smṛtā

Vāyu P. Ibid. 19. 37

Bha. Gītā 8. 17
sahasrayugaparyantamaharyadbrahmaṇo viduḥ|
rātrim yugasahasrāntām tehorātra vido janāḥ|

Vāyu P. Ch. 100. 131
caturyuga sahasrāntamaharyad brahmaṇo viduḥ||
rātrim yugasahasrāntamaho rātra vido janāḥ ||

Bha. Gītā III. 13
bhuñjate te tvagham pāpa ye pacantyātmakāraṇāt|

Vāyu P. Ch. 76. 20

ṛṇam ca bhuṅkte pāpātma yaḥ pacehyatmakāraṇāt |

Āśvalāyana śrauta sūtra II. 6

somāya pitṛumate svadhā namo
agnye kavyavāhanāya svadhānama iti ||

and *Āpastamba śrauta sūtra* I, 7, 3-4

somāya pitṛpitāya svadhānama iti dakṣiṇagnau juhoti |
yamāyāṅgirasavate pitṛmate svadha nama iti dvitīyāyam |
agnaye kavyavāhanāya svadha nama iti tṛtīyāyam

Vāyu P. Ch. 75. 56-57

agnaye kavyavāhanāya svadhā aṅgirase namaḥ |
somāya vai pitṛmate svadhā aṇgirase namaḥ |
yama caivāṅgirase svadhā nama iti bruvan |

Mahābhārata XIII, 137, 26, 30, 35

pāṅkteyāmstu pravakṣyāmi jyeyāste paṅkti pāvanāḥ |
tṛṇāciketaḥ pañcāgnistrisuparṇaḥ ṣaḍaṅgavit ||
brahmadeyānusamtānaschandago jyeṣṭa sāmagaḥ ||

* * * * *

* * * * *

ye ca puṇyeṣu tīrtheṣu abhiṣekakṛtaśramāḥ |
makheṣu ca samantreṣu bhavantyavabhṛtha plutāḥ ||
akrodhanāḥ hyacapalāḥ kṣānta dāntajitendriyāḥ |
sarvabhūta hita ye ca śrāddheṣvetannimaṇtrayāh ||
ye ca bhāṣya vidāḥ kecit ye ca vyākaraṇe ratāḥ |
adhīyate purāṇam ye ca dharmaśāstrānyathāpi ca ||

Vāyu P. 82. 52–55

sarva vedavratasnātāḥ pāṇktīnām pāvanāḥ dvijāḥ |
ye ca bhāṣyavido mukhyā ye ca vyākaraṇe ratāḥ |
adhīyate purāṇam ca dharmaśāstram tathaiva ca |
tṛṇāciketa pañcāgnistrisuparṇaḥ ṣaḍaṅgavit ||

This quotation is an instance of the Purāṇa quoting post-Purāṇic works. This section of ch. 82 of the Purāṇa (sl. 51-87) is clearly an interpolation and must have been adopted from the *Mahābhārata* where a fuller and continuous description of the subject is furnished.

SECTION V

A Critical Study of Indian Cosmogony

The problems offered by the mythological concepts of the creation of the world and the theory of fourteen worlds and of seven oceans as explained in the Purāṇa literature, have baffled the attempts of earnest

students of ancient Indian geography to find for them a rational explanation.[1] Let us see what solution the *Vāyu Purāṇa* furnishes.

The term Purāṇa as defined in this *Purāṇa*[2] shows that the created universe took its origin from the ultimate entity. Western philosophy teaches us that cosmological conceptions are not the same but differ in respect of every individual. There is the Supreme Being called Maheśvara or Brahman without whose aid Māyā cannot act. Māyā is Prakṛiti with whose help Īśvara engages himself in the work of creation. While Īśvara is the Creator, Jīva or the individual soul is the enjoyer. Creation and destruction can be connoted by two modern terms—evolution and involution. Two stages of evolution, the subtle and the gross, are distinguished (*sūkṣma* and *sthūla*). This universe is said to have originated from a mythical lotus (*lokapadma*)[3] grown in the navel of the great Īśvara. The second stage is reached when the five gross elements exist in their infinite form.

The account of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* about the fourteen lokas may be briefly given. Loka is eternal, Aloka is transient and Lokāloka is neither eternal nor transient. The latter is preceded and followed by Aloka and Nirāloka, the world of limitless darkness.[4] The philosophical view of these fourteen lokas is that there are fourteen stages (*sthānas*)[5] which are to be crossed by practice of yoga, tapas etc.

[1] Mr. R. Narayana Aiyar has made an attempt in this direction in his *History of the Bharatavarṣa*.
[2] Ch. I. 203.
[3] Ch. 34, 41 f.
[4] *Vāyu Purāṇa* Ch. 49. 144 ff. ch. 50. 156 ff.

[5] चतुर्दशैवस्थानानि वर्णितानि महर्षिभिः ।
लोकाख्यानि तु यानि स्युर्येषु तिष्ठन्तिमानवाः ॥
सप्त तेषु कृतान्याहुरकृतानि तु सप्त वै ।
भूरादयस्तु संख्याताः सप्त लोकाः कृतास्त्विह ।
अकृतानि तु सप्तैव प्राकृतानि तु यानिवै ।
स्थानानि स्थानिभिः सार्धं कृतानि तु निबन्धनम् ॥
पृथिवीं चान्तरिक्षं च दिव्यं यश्च महः स्मृतम् ।
स्थानान्येतानि चत्वारि स्मृतान्यार्णवकानि च ॥
क्षयातिशययुक्तानि तथा युक्तानि वक्ष्यते ।
यानि नैमित्तिकानि स्युस्तिष्ठन्त्याभूतसंप्लवम् ॥
जनस्तपश्च सत्यं च स्थानान्येतानि त्रीणितु
ऐकान्तिकानि सत्वानि तिष्ठन्तो हाऽऽप्तसंयमात्

Vāyu. ch. 101, 10–15.

to finally attain the *Satyaloka* from which there is no turning back. In the same way the *Vāyu Purāṇa* again explains away the seven worlds of the earth[1] and the seven oceans as alluding to the working of the seven *prakṛtis* from a philosophical view-point.[2] Thus the concept underlying the creation is, according to unambiguous statement of the Purāṇa, philosophical, and not material. The followers of the latter theory misinterpret these terms and try to locate some of them in Asia Minor and other parts of the known world.[3] There is besides the mythical Meru as the centre of the earth of seven islands which have again the *Jambū dvīpa* in their centre. Meru is mythical in the sense that it is said to belong to the world of gods.[4] In the light of the above data, the concept of fourteen *lokas*, of seven islands of the earth and of Meru is a philosophical concept and is allied more to the religious development than to physical entities constituting actual geographical divisions of the earth with mountains, rivers and cities.

There is one more thing that deserves some examination. It is the division of *Jambūdvīpa* into nine continents (*varṣas*) of which the *Bhārata varṣa* occupies the southernmost part of the hemisphere.[5]

It is a vexed question to identify Bharata after whose name this continent is known. There are a number of Bharatas and each Purāṇa creates some Bharata or other. The *Vāyu Purāṇa* speaks of him as Brahmodanāgni, son of Vaidyuta (*Laukikāgni*) who is the first son of Brahma. The same difficulty crops up when we define the limits of the *Bhārata-varṣa*. According to one version it is the region bounded on the north by the Himalayas and on the south by the ocean.[6] This country is said to have been subdivided into nine parts surrounded by the sea and consequently not easily accessible from one part to the other.[7] If we apply modern geographical

[1] These are Plakṣadvīpa, Śālmalidvīpa, Kuśadvīpa, Krauñcadvīpa Śakadvīpa, Puṣkaradvīpa, and Jambūdvīpa. (Ch. 49, 132.)

[2] Ch. 49, 180-185.

[3] See Q.J.M.S. Vol. xv, xvi and xvii, articles by V. Venkaṭāchala Aiyar.

[4] सर्वदेवनिकायानि संनिविष्टान्यनेकशः ॥
देवलोको गिरौ तस्मिन्सर्वश्रुतिषु गीयते ॥
Ibid., 95. Chap. 34, 69.

See also Alberuni's *India* ch. xxiii.

[5] हिमाह्वं दक्षिणं वर्षं भरताय न्यवेदयत् ।
तस्मात्तद्भारतं वर्षं तस्य नाम्ना विदुर्बुधाः ॥
Ch. 33, 52.

[6] Ch. 45, 75.

[7] *Ibid* 78-80. These are Indradvīpa, Kaseru, Tāmravarṇi, Gabhastimān, Nāgadvīpa, Saumya, Gandharva and Vāruṇa and the last being that surrounded by the sea.

knowledge in our investigation, either the Purāṇa account must be taken to be wrong or the whole is legendary description drawn from the imagination of the poet.

In the absence of definite data we have to resort to philosophy again for light. The Purāṇa speaks of the saline ocean as represening the miseries of the world.

In the same way *Bhāratavarṣa* is a *karma bhūmi* while the remaining eight divisions represent the eight siddhis (*aṣṭaiśvarya*) as the result of proper practice of Karma.[1] If the hypothesis in the foregoing pages is granted we have to admit the Purāṇa's ignorance of regions beyond the Ancient Indian continent. But this could not be. The *Vāyu Purāṇa* has a tendency to view everything with a philosophical vision. There is room for the belief that genuine tradition has been mixed up with the mythical, and an endeavour to separate fact from fiction may not prove unfruitful.

This can be done only in the light of researches in archæology and geology. Progress in archæological and geological research has enabled some savants to come forward with new theories of identification of the Purāṇa divisions of the world. The identification of Rasātala or the Underworld with Central Asia including Tartary and Turkestan by Nundo Lal De,[2] Puruṣottamakṣetra with the modern Orissa division of Bihar and Orissa province,[3] the geological confirmation claimed for the great Deluge, the theory that the Dekhan plateau was once connected with Africa and Australia, and the probable connection of Dravidians with the Sumerians[4] are some examples. It may be that future research throws more light on some of these dark spaces of Ancient History enabling us to reconstruct a historical geography of ancient India.

THE NINE DIVISIONS OF INDIA

To what geographical territory the term *Bhāratavarṣa* is to be assigned is still a bone of contention among scholars. One school of scholars maintains that it means Indian empire as it is today, including perhaps Burma. Others are of opinion that *Bharatavarṣa* means Greater India and will therefore include Maḷaya Peninsula, Indian Archipelago, and even Indo-China. The earliest among modern writers on ancient geography of India is Mr. Cunningham. He gave the names of these nine divisions as furnished by the *Mahābhārata*, and the *Purāṇas* with the remark that this division

[1] Ch. 45, 77. For a detailed study of the subject see *History of the Bhāratavarṣa*.

[2] I.H.Q. Vols. I and II.

[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. V, pp. 659-665.

[4] *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 25-47.

does not agree with that of Varāhamihira.[1] It would appear that the nine divisions refer to the Purāṇic geographical divisions of Ancient Indian continent which included Burma. In the absence of definite evidence our investigation may not take us much farther. But though the nine divisions are termed *dvipas*, we must understand the term in the sense in which Pāṇini, the grammarian, uses it. It is that territory which has, on its two sides, water. This means that rivers in India marked the boundary limits of these nine territorial divisions.

In determining approximately the boundary limits occupied by these nine territories we have to proceed with caution. The order in which the Purāṇa or Purāṇas mention need not deter us long.[2] There is no sacredness about the order in which these divisions are mentioned. Taking the first division Indradvīpa, it seems to be a reference to Burma. It is also known in literature as Aindra dvīpa. Ptolemy speaks of the coast of the Airrhadoi commencing with the eastern coast of the gulf of Bengal from the mouth of the Brahmaputra down to that of the Nāf or even the Arakan river. Gerini however identifies Airrhadoi with the Āndhras and infers that Ptolemy's is a reference to the coast of the Āndhras.[3] The argument adduced in favour of this is far-fetched and inconclusive. For the river Airāvadi which is in Burma has a closer affinity to Indra, for his riding animal is named Airāvata. Tradition has for long identified Indra as the *dikpāla* of the East, and Ptolemy is therefore right in his location of the Airrhadoi. It is then the territory between the rivers Brahmaputra and the Airāvati. Next in order is mentioned the territory known as Kaserumat or simply Kaserudvīpa. Kaseru is perhaps the same as Kazëḥ or Kasëḥ, Krasëḥ (Kasay) and Kassay refers to Manipūr and Assam in general[4]. Hence it seems that Kaseru is a corrupted form of Krasëḥ or Kasëḥ and is therefore a reference to Eastern Bengal and Assam. This identification gains support from the fact that the hills which separate Maṇipūr from the Assam valley are known even now as the Khasia hills.

Hereafter it would lead us astray if the order of the Purāṇa is strictly followed. It is not patent whether the Purāṇa aimed at any definite order in the enumeration of the various divisions. For Tāmravarṇi (also Tāmraparṇi) is mentioned as the third in order. It has been shown conclusively that in centuries before the Christian era the island of Ceylon was called Taprobane. That it was also

[1] Cal. edition 1924, p. 8. See also Alberuni's India, ch. xxix, esp. p. 296.
[2] See also Bhāskarācārya's *Siddhānta Śiromaṇi*, ch. iii, 41.
[3] *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography*, 1909, pp. 28–9.
[4] See Gerini, *Researches on Ptolemy*, p. 795.

a designation of the Sumatra island is obvious. Hence Ceylon is Taprobana major and Sumatra is Taprobana minor.[1] The Tāmraparṇi of the Purāṇa is the island of Ceylon and cannot be Sumatra, being far away from the Indian continent. The ninth dvīpa which is defined by the *Vāyu Purāṇa* as that which is surrounded by the sea[2] is probably the Kumāri so named by Rājaśekhara in his *Kāvyamīmamsa*[3]. In defining the limits of Kumāridvīpa, Rājaśekhara says that here are found seven hills : Vindhyas, Pāriyātra, Śuktimān, Ṛkṣaparvata, Mahendra, Sahya, and Malaya. While Pāriyātra, Śuktimān and Ṛkṣaparvata are identified with portions of the Vindhya range, the Mahendra is Eastern ghats commencing from Kaliṅga and joining with the Malaya hills. The Sahya again is a part of the Western ghats. Thus according to Rājaśekhara it is South India, of which the Vindhya ranges formed the northern limit.[5] We have thus defined the limits of four dvīpas and we have therefore to look for the remaining five in northern India, north of the Vindhyas and south of the Himalayas. As Indra is the *dikpāla* of the East, Varuṇa is that of the West. It is significant that the Purāṇa begins with Indra and ends with Varuṇa. Hence *Varuṇa dvīpa* is the Western portion of India and has to be located to the west of the Gāndhāra country. For Gāndhāra which perhaps takes its name from the residents of the territory who were known to be Gandharvas is mentioned as a distinct division separate from *Varuṇadvīpa*. As *Indradvīpa* is the easternmost, the *Varuṇadvīpa* is the westernmost.

The remaining three are *Nāgadvīpa*, *Gabhastimān* and *Saumya*. Gerini's identification of Nāgadvīpa with Ceylon or a part of Ceylon does not seem to be conclusive.[6] In fact it seems to be that there were a number of small islands round about Ceylon and in the Indian Archipelago which were the home of the ancient nāga tribes. In the list of nine divisions both *Tāmraparṇi* and *Nāgadvīpa* are mentioned. If the former is identified with Ceylon, the *Nāgadvīpa* cannot be Ceylon. If it is to be maintained that it was a part of Ceylon, the ancient Purāṇa compiler could not have assigned two

[1] *Ibid.* p. 651.
[2] *Ayamtu navamsteṣām dvīpaḥ sāgara saṃvṛtaḥ*, ch. 45, 80.
[3] Gaekwad Or. Ser. No. 1, p. 92.

[4] अत्र च कुमारीद्वीपे—

विन्ध्यश्च पारियात्रश्च शुक्तिमानृक्षपर्वतः ।

महेन्द्रसह्यमलयाः सप्तैते कुलपर्वताः ॥

I. Ch. XVII.

[5] See Nundo Lal De's *Geographical Dictionary*, Cal. Orient Series, pp. 149, 168, 196 etc. also J. B. O. R. S., 1922, pp. 41-43.
[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 380.

out of 9 divisions to Ceylon, which is insignificant in size, if the whole of India is to be reckoned. Therefore one has to seek elsewhere this *Nāgadvīpa* of the Purāṇa. Nāga also means elephants. The island of Elephanta can be a possible conjecture. It is very important to note here that the Tamil literary tradition locates nāgadvīpa in the neighbourhood of Gāndhāra, and recognises both as divisions of the Jambūdvipa.[1] Two more divisions remain, and these are *Gabhastimān* and *Saumya* which must be territorial units lying to the east of the Gāndhara and to the west of Assam and possibly to the north of the Vindhyas. *Saumya* may mean moon or cool and moist. *Gabhastimān* may mean sun, or hot and dry. It may, therefore, be surmised that these divisions are after the nature of the soil. *Saumya* may roughly correspond to Bengal and the United Provinces to the east of Delhi, and *Gabhastimān* to the Delhi province and States of Rājputana.

SECTION VI

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE PURĀṆA

The philosophical portions of the Purāṇa are to be handled with discrimination and good sense. Among the six schools of Hindu Philosophy, three schools, the Vedānta, the Sāṁkhya and the Yoga are in evidence. While the Vedānta principles underlie the philosophic concept of the whole Purāṇa, the Yoga seems to preponderate at first sight. Touches of the Sāṁkhya doctrines are indeed there, but are not the prevailing factor. No doubt the place of honour is given to the Yoga, its principles and practice, besides a special description of the *Pāśupata Yoga*. There are roughly ten chapters on this subject including the three (11, 14 and 15) on the *Pāśupata Yoga*. The other chapters relate to accidents to Yogas (*Yogāpasargas*), powers acquired by Yoga (*Yogaiśvaryas*), purity in the practice (*śaucācāra-lakṣaṇam*), the result of that practice (*paramāśrama prāpti*); the yoga of the incarnation of Māheśvara (*māheśvarāvatāra yoga*). Other characteristics of the Yoga quoted piecemeal in the last chapters of the book (100-2) deal with descriptions of celestial regions, periodical destructions, and creations. The general chapters on the practice of yoga and the results thereof not only fall in with the precepts and the tenets of the Yoga school of philosophy but also seem to anticipate the Yoga school still to come.[2] It is not easy to fix definite chronological limits to the origin of the Yoga school as such. This practice said to be peculiar to the Buddhists has been

[1] See the interesting essay of Prof. H. Jacobi entitled *Über Das Ursprungliche Yoga system* (Berlin, 1929).
[2] See *Maṇimenalai*, XI, ll. 17-21.

traced back to the Chalcolithic period of Indian History. In the recent discoveries at Mohenjadāro and Hārappa there are sculptures, broken statues, the prototype of the images of Buddha and Jina, 'with head, neck and body quite erect and half-shut eyes fixed on the tip of the nose,' the exact posture of one practising yoga .... 'the yatis of the protohistoric and prehistoric Indus valley.'[1]

This is exactly what the Purāṇa furnishes :

संवृतास्योऽवबद्धाक्ष उरो विष्टभ्य चाग्रतः—
किंचिदुन्नामितशिराः शिरोग्रीवां तथैव च ।
संप्रेक्ष्य नासिकाग्रं स्वं दिशश्चानवलोकयन् ॥

Vāyu Ch. 11, 15-16.

The inference, then, is that the Yoga tradition is a very old tradition traceable to the third and fourth millennium B. C. The Purāṇa came to narrate this ancient tradition and it is probable that after the introduction of the Yoga school as such, its philosophical tenets were ushered in, as supplementing in a manner the old tradition. For example, mention is made of the eight limbs (*aṅgas*) of the Yoga.[2] These are *āsanam* (sitting posture), *prā-ṇarōdha* (suppression of the breath), *pratyāhara* (abstention from sense objects), *dhāraṇī* (mental concentration), *dhyānam* (religious meditation), *samādhi* (ecstatic contemplation on the supreme soul), *yama* (paramount duties), and *niyama* (minor duties).

This agrees with the statement of Patañjali, yama-niyamāsana prāṇāyāma-pratyāhāra-dhāraṇadhyāna-samādhayoṣṭāvaṅgāni.[3]

In the *Maitri-upaniṣad* however only six *aṅgas* of the yoga are referred to, and *yamaniyamas* have been omitted.

tathā tatprayogakalpaḥ prāṇāyāmaḥ pratyāhāro dhyānam dhāraṇa tarkaḥ samādiḥ ṣaḍaṅga ityucyate yogaḥ.[4] From this one can see the gradual development of the Yoga system. The statement of the Purāṇa with regard to the eight *aṅgas* occurs in the chapter entitled *Vyāsasaṁśayāpanodanam*, which at first sight seems out of place. For the actual narration of the Purāṇa has ended with the previous

[1] R. Chanda, *memoirs of the Arch. Survey of India* No. 41, pp. 33-34.

[2] आसनं प्राणरोधश्च प्रत्याहारश्च धारणा ।
ध्यानं समाधिरेतानि यमैश्च नियमैः सह ।
अष्टाङ्गानि यदर्थं च चरन्ति मुनिपुङ्गवाः ॥

Ch. 104, 24-25.

[3] *Yoga sūtras* II, 29.

[4] VI, 18, Ānand. Series : *Upaniṣadām samuccayaḥ*, p. 421.

chapter. If it is contended that it forms a part of the Purāṇa in question, then the composition of this particular chapter is to be assigned to the epoch immediately following that of Patañjali, the author of the *Yogasūtra* who perhaps flourished in the 4th century A.D.[1]

History teaches us that the Yoga school which died hard in this ancient land came to an end with the commencement of the Christian era. The Buddha was perhaps the last representative of the old Yoga school in practice. The *advaita* school which became more and more popular and claimed a larger number of adherents to its fold incorporated into it the salient features of both the Yoga and the Sāṁkhya so that the general principles of different schools became common and readily acceptable. This metamorphosis took place, we are led to conjecture, in the period of the *Upaniṣads*. For the *Upaniṣads* are nothing but Vedānta treatises, effecting a reconciliation with other schools of thought and philosophy. The *Vāyu Purāṇa* is the typical representative of this transformation, as it nowhere preaches exclusive worship of a particular deity. It speaks of Śiva Puram and Viṣṇu · Puram ; of the greatness of Śiva and of Viṣṇu and of Brahmā, thus seeming to inaugurate a system of preferential worship of the different deities. But in the whole of a chapter (66) it knocks down the theory of the worship of Śiva, Viṣṇu and Brahmā as separate deities and as different from one another. It is explicit when it says[2] there is only one supreme Being whom it calls Nārāyaṇa, the god who finds his bed in the waters of the ocean, for it may be remembered the first element created was water [3] ; and Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Siva are its different manifestations charged with special duties to be discharged.[4]

It characteristically remarks[5] that he who finds out difference among these deities is a sinner against God and he who finds

[1] Hopkins, J. A. O. S. XXII, pp. 335-36. J. H. Woods *Intro. to the Yoga System of Patañjali* H. O. S. Vol. 17.

[2] रुद्रं ब्रह्माणमिन्द्रं च लोकपालानृषीन्दनून् ।
देवं तमेकं बहुधा प्राहुर्नारायणं द्विजाः ॥

Vāyu Purāṇa, 66.122.

[3] *Ibid.*, Ch. 23.110.

[4] एकात्मा स त्रिधा भूत्वा संमोहयति यः प्रजाः ।

[2] *Ibid.*, 116.

[5] एकं निन्दति यस्तेषां सर्वानेव स निन्दति ।
एकं यो वेत्ति पुरुषं तमाहुर्ब्रह्मवादिनम् ॥

Ibid., Ch. 66.114.

similarity among these deities is a man of knowledge. The Paramātma or Yogeśvara engages himself in different *līlās* or sports and each *līlā* takes the character of an incarnation, and new names are assigned to each of them to differentiate the one from the other.[1]

It then transpires that the Purāṇa soars high in the realm of ***advaita*** philosophy which knows of only one Supreme Being *nirguṇa* (void of attributes), all the others being His manifestations. The following expressions clarify this statement :

Pradhāna Puruṣa, Kṣetrakṣetrajña, Sadasadātmaka, Brahmasatram Sanātanam etc., 101.86.

The aim of the philosophical teaching of this Purāṇa is that the world is pervaded by Māya, and that there is no reality about it.[2] Pradhāna, Prakṛti and Māya are all synonymous terms. The only real thing is Iśvara, Maheśvara, Nārāyaṇa, Ādi-Brahmā or whatever name we are pleased to give it. What is needed is the realisation of the oneness of this real Being. For this the Purāṇa preaches the path of Yoga, taking care at the same time to mention that Yoga is rooted in Karma, with the implication that only a Karmayogin can become a Jñana-yogin.[3] In recommending this supreme path of Yoga, the Purāṇa does not fail to mention the general reflections on the subject by other schools of philosophy, especially Vedānta and Sāṁkhya. This is how we have to interpret the Vedānta and Sāṁkhya portions or rather the Sāṁkhya and the Yoga portions. One more evidence to show that the Purāṇa has a leaning towards the yogins is the fact that it reports[4] that the Siddhās or yogins will be wandering in different disguises in the world, and a man of wisdom must take care to offer *pūja* to them whenever they come to him. Another injunction of the Purāṇa [5]

[1] See the whole of the chapter entitled *Māheśvaravatāra Yoga*.

[2] माययाकृतमाचष्टे मायो देवो महेश्वरः ।
Ch. 101.219.

[3] कर्माभ्यासकृताशुद्धिः वेदान्तेषुपलक्ष्यते ।
Ibid., 101.87.

[4] सिद्धा हि विप्ररूपेण चरन्ति पृथिवीमिमाम् ।
तस्मादतिथिमायान्तं अभिगच्छेत्कृताञ्जलिः ॥
Ch. 71.74.

[5] सहस्रशस्तु विप्रान्वै भोजयेद्यावदागतान् ।
एकस्तु योगवित्प्रीतः सर्वानर्हति तच्छृणु ॥
ब्रह्मचारि सहस्रेण योगी ह्येको विशिष्यते ।
71.76 *Ibid.*, 69.

is that these *siddhas* and *yatis* (ascetics) must be fed on the śrāddha occasion. A śrāddha performed with one yogin is said to be superior to a śrāddha with a thousand Brahmans or brahmacāriṇs. The practice of feeding ascetics and yogins for the śrāddha had long fallen into disuse. And the fact that the Purāṇa is full of it, bears ample testimony to its antiquity. This is not all. There is no reference in this Purāṇa to the Tantric system of worship which consists of Devi being regarded as Śakti. Though we do not know for certain when this particular form of worship came into being, we know this for certain that it was not popularly prevalent in the age when the *Vāyu Purāṇa* was composed.

Added to this is the fact that the Purāṇa does not refer to the Buddha or his tenets. The same may be said of Jainism. No doubt the terms arhāya, buddhaye, buddhāya occur and are used as the names of Śiva and in their ordinary meaning one worthy of honour, one full of wisdom etc.[1] In fact the very term Buddha in the sense of jñāni occurs in the chapter on Pāśupata Yoga[2]. Mention was made of the Pāśupata-yoga described in detail in the Purāṇa. The *Vāyavīya saṃhitā* of the *Śiva Purāṇa* has also a section on the *Pāśupatīyavratam.* Besides these stray expressions which have the ordinary meaning, we do not come across any special reference to either of these monastic sects. It is therefore inferable to assign to this Purāṇa a date earlier than the fifth century B. C. A study of the relevant chapters (11, 14 and 15) shows that the Yoga under reference is only the exalted form of *prāṇāyāma* constituting pratyāhāra, āsanam, dhāranam, dhyānam which are the means to the application of yoga in practice (*yoga pravṛtti*). To this end cleansing of the body of all unwholesome matter, and keeping under control the five vital airs, prāṇa, apāna, samāna, udāna, and vyāna are recommended. The term *pāśupata* comes from the expression Paśupati, the lord of creatures. It is an epithet in use in Vedic literature as synonym of Rudra.[3]

We know of an Upaniṣad *Atharvaṣiras* devoted to the Pāśupata theology. The *Vāyu Purāṇa* refers to this system. The Pāśupata are *Ūrdhvaretas* (eternal Brahmacārins), tapasvinaḥ (penance-performers), and have their bodies smeared with sacred ashes. It is significant to note that this purāṇa contains the earliest reference to the Lakulīśa Pāśupatas.[4]

It is said that in the twenty-eighth *mahāyuga* when Viṣṇu incarnates himself as Vāsudeva on the earth, Śiva takes the incarnation of

[1] Ch. 97, 172 and 176.
[2] Ch. 11, 9.
[3] See Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*.
[4] See R. D. Bhandarkar : J. B. B. R. A. S., 1908, p. 151.

Lakuli by Yogamāya and enters a certain dead body in the burial ground of Kāyāvarohaṇa, a siddhakṣetra. His pupils are four: Kuśika, Gārgya, Mitraka and Ruṣta who will be initiated into what is also known as *Māheśvaryam Yogam* and who will find solace in the Rudralokam.[1]

This reference has an important historical bearing, It demonstrates the period when the subsect Lakuliśas had come into being. Bhandarkar assigns their origin to about the first century A. D., though it cannot be accepted as final. Epigraphical and archæological testimony connote some such system in vogue. An inscription in an old shrine near the temple of Ēkliṅgi, near Uḍaipūr has it that Śiva was incarnate in that region with a club (*lakula*) in his hand and the modern Kārvān in Rajputana is identified with Kāyāvarohaṇa as per local *māhātmya*.[2]

Added to this is the fact that a good number of Lakulīśa images have been found in Gujarat and Rājputana with this peculiarity, viz., Śiva having two arms and a small rod in one of his hands. Besides, the South Indian inscriptions[3] call for notice the Lakulīśa Pāśupatas.

This proves beyond contradiction that the sect spread itself out as far south as the Tamil countries. A study of the Śaiva literature inclines us to divide the whole body of the Śaivas into two classes, the Āgamic and non-Āgamic. To the latter class belong the Pāśupata Śaivas among whom a number of subsects can be distinguished. In the category of the Āgamic followers of the Śaiva school come the Kāṣmir Śaivas, Vīra Śaivas and the followers of the Śaiva Siddhānta. It would appear that the Pāśupatas did not accept the *Āgamas*, or rather the Āgama school was a later growth in the tree of Indian Śaivism. The difference of these new schools is minor, and is seen in the fact that the Āgamic Śaivas do not accept the theory of incarnation of Śiva as such though their books are full of legends illustrating the different manifestations of invisible forms. It is important to note, however, that the Śaiva devotees in the Tamil land and the Vīra Śaivas are[3] styled Māheśvaras[4] thus showing the closer affinity of their doctrines to the original Pāśupata sect. For, according to the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, the Pāśupata Yogam is nothing but the Māheśvaryam Yogam[5]. If this is understood the

[1] See Vāyu Purāṇa ch. 23, st. 218-24.

[2] In South India it is interesting to know that Kānci, Kumbakonum and Negapatam are celebrated as Kāyārohana Kṣetras.
An. R of Ar. Dept. 1906-7 pp. 179-192.
Cp. Fleet, J. R. A. S. 1907 p. 419 ff.

[3] See S. Ind. Ins. vol. III, No. 18 pp. 27–29. *Cp.* Ep. Rep. 443 of 1914 and 109 of 1912.

[4] *Cp.* the expression Maheśvara pūja.

[5] Chapter 23–224.

imaginary difference between later and old schools of Śaiva philosophy is bound to disappear. From this one has to infer that these philosophical sections of the Purāṇa were composed in the pre-Āgamic epoch. The above examination may then lend the impression that the Purāṇa is sectarian in outlook and is a document of the early Śaiva school. That there is no warrant for this impression has already been indicated. Besides, we have the following. There are two informing chapters (97 and 98) entitled *Viṣṇumāhātmya kīrtanam* which, far from being sectarian in character, soars aloft in the region of *advaita* philosophy.[1] The legends of Viṣṇu are handled with equal interest, importance and prominence. This is not all. The Purāṇa characterises the Supreme Being with the appellation of Nārāyaṇa and this Being by contact with the respective *guṇas*, assumes different forms. He is Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. He is Rudra, Indra, Lokapālas, Sages, etc.[2] Nārāyaṇa is not taken here as a sectarian Vaiṣṇava deity but as Supreme Being which exhibits itself as *kṣetrajña* and *bījam*, *prakṛti* and *yoni*.[3]

He is Īśvara or Yogīśvara.[4] We may refer in this connection to some quotations from this Purāṇa by Vācaspatimiśra in his explanations on the 5th *sūtra* of Book IV. The *sūtra* is ' Actions are many and different. The mind that urges them is only one.'

pravṛttibhede prayojakaṃ cittamekamanekeṣām ||

The Purāṇa which stands for the social polity of *varṇāsrama dharma* and for the promotion of *yajñas* and *dāna*, extols *tapas* or penance performance as the superior *dharma* leading to *Kaivalya* or supreme isolation.[5]

References again to theistic yoga are in evidence. There is an interesting reference to Pañcaśikha who is said to be a sage and a son of the Creator.[6] The term occurs with other equally important names like those of Voḍhu, Āsuri and Kapia who are all reckoned as Brahma's sons. Students of Indian philosophy have been puzzled with this name Pañcaśikha, who is regarded to be the father of theistic yoga and author of a manual of *sūtras* which is now lost to us.[7] In the light of the references to him in the *Mahābhārata*[8] Pañcaśikha seems to be a historical personage. The epic has it that he was the originator of the Vaiṣṇava sect, the *Pāñcarātra*, and this is

[1] See for example, sl. 78 ff.
[2] Chapter 66, 101 ff., chapter 119–123; chapter 101, 228; chapter 104. 43-58.
[3] Chapter 101. 228.
[4] Patañjali, *Yoga Sūtras*.
[5] Chapter 57, 115 to the end.
[6] Chapter 101, 388.
[7] See Keith, *Sāṃkhya System*, pp. 42–4 (Cal). Garbe, *Sāṃkhya Philosophie*. p. 34.
[8] XII, 218–14, see also Hopkins' *Great Epic*, p. 144.

not impossible as the Vaiṣṇava theology has its basis on Sāṃkhya-yoga.[1]

The other names refer again to historical philosophers of ancient India, Voḍhu, Kapila and Āsuri. In the *pitritarpana* portion of the *Gṛhya sūtras* of the Ṛg. Veda, Weber informs us that Kapila, Āsuri, Pañcaśikha and Voḍha occupy a very honourable place.[2] Voḍhu again figures as a teacher in the epic as also Kapila and Āsuri.[3] All of them are, according to the Vāyu Purāṇa, sons of Brahmā, the Creator and Voḍhu is placed before Kapila, Āsuri and Pañcaśikha. To the last of these Garbe[4] assigns the date of the first century A.D. and if this were to be taken as the working basis, Āsuri whom the *Mahābhārata* claims as a teacher of Pañcaśikha must be assigned to the same period. In the evidence of Āsuri's name being mentioned in literary works of a different character and of different epochs, it cannot be that Āsuri is a mere name as Prof. Keith would have it.[5] Whether Pañcaśikha was his pupil or no, there can be no doubt about the historic Āsuri as also historic Voḍhu and Kapila.[6] If we place any faith in the order in which the Purāṇa mentions the names as an evidence of chronology, Voḍhu is earlier in time than Kapila, the celebrated philosopher. It would appear that these with their forerunners Sanaka, Sanātana and Sanantana belonged to a common school of philosophy which became lost in obscure tradition at a very early period. But tradition which died hard in this land claimed a divinity to these ancient teachers by making all of them sons of the Creator.

The closing portions of the chapter (57) reveal a certain stage in the evolution of the life of ancient Indians. Sacrificial rituals and ceremonies have lost their ancient glamour, and their objective was an intense search after truth by renunciation and deep contemplation. This presupposes a period when the germs of future philosophical systems have been laid. The different systems are mingled together so much that it is impossible to say whether the teachings are of any one of the schools, like the Sāṁkhya, Yoga or the Vedānta. In this respect the Purāṇa is on a par with the Upaniṣads. Many passages may be cited embodying monistic principles. The whole of chapter (66) is one of the examples in point.[7] After all the end and aim of the realisation of the three Puruṣārthas, Dharma, Artha, and Kāma is the

[1] See J. N. Farquhar: *Religious Literature of India*, p. 99.
[2] *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 236 n.
[3] XII, 218, 14.
[4] *Sāṁkhya Philosophie*, p. 34.
[5] *Sāṁkhya System*, p. 41.
[6] Compare the version of the Chinese translation of the commentary on the *Sāṁkhya Kārika* in the *Bulletin d'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme Orient* IV, 59.
[7] See also Chapter 101, 105 ff., 102, 131–2, 71–3.

attainment of salvation or Mokṣa. This is different for the diverse schools of religion, prevalent from earliest times. By making a statement like the following

अभावः पुनरुत्पत्तौ शान्तानामर्चिषामिव ।

the Purāṇa seems to reiterate (Chapter 7–42) the *advaita* conception of Mokṣa.[1] In another place it preaches the lofty doctrine of the *advaitasiddhi.*[2] Again the *Pariṇāma vivṛtti* idea accepted by Śaṅkara, the founder of the *advaita* philosophy is elaborated in chapter 59, st. 70–76.[3]

Let us now examine some more passages which have *Sāṁkhya* tendencies in them. Much material is scattered in chapters 102–3. Prakṛti is equivalent of Pradhāna or Māyā, and the great Īśvara is said to uphold this Māyā.[4] This is exactly in line with the doctrine of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniaṣd* IV. 10.

मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरं ।
तस्यावयवभूतैस्तु व्याप्तं सर्वमिदं जगत् ॥

Maheśvara is described here as the lord of Māya and therefore the Prakṛti mentioned here is not an independent Prakṛti of the advanced Sāṁkhya school but an entity dependent upon the Supreme Being.[5]

The spirit underlying the doctrine of three *guṇas* is Sāṁkhya but this conception is associated with the doctrines of other schools of philosophy or religious sects.[6] We thus find the systems of philosophy in their crude stages; their full development is still a thing of the future, another evidence in favour of the antiquity of the Purāṇa.

(*To be continued.*)

[1] See also chapter 104–97.
[2] Chapter 101–88.
[3] For other references to the *Advaita* principles, see chapter 66, 143 ; 79–95: 97 ; 80 ff ; 100, 242 f., 101, 26 ff ; *Ibid.* 79–80 ff., 105–7 ; 228 ; 104, 29–30.
[4] 101, 218–19.
[5] Intro. p. XI of the *Śvetāśvatara Up.* Pāṇinī Office, Allahabad, 1916.
[6] 103, 24 ff., chapter V. 17–20.

REVIEWS

AN ILLUSTRATED ARDHA MĀGADHI DICTIONARY, by Śātāvadhāni Jaina Muni Śrī Ratnachandrāji Maharāj : Vol. I, 511 pages (1923) and Vol. II, 1002 pages (1927). Vol. I published by Kesarichand Bhandari for the S. S. Jaina Conference. Vol. II published by Sardarmal Bhandari for the S. S. Jaina Conference. To be had of the Panjab Sanskrit Book Depot, Lahore, and of Probsthain & Co., Oriental Booksellers, 41, Great Russel Street, London W. C. 1.

The Ardha Māgadhi is an important Prākrta language. Its special value is that Śrī Mahāvīra conveyed his teachings originally in this language and that the Jaina Scriptures were originally written in it. Scholars interested in Indological studies in general and in the study of Jaina literature in particular were suffering from a great handicap due to the want of a reliable dictionary of the Ardha Māgadhi language. This long-felt desideratum is now supplied by this well-designed and trustworthy dictionary of the Ardha Māgadhi language. The scope of this dictionary is rightly restricted to the words used in the canonical sūtras of the Śvetāmbaras ; and the meanings given are the meanings which these words bear in the sūtras. This fact, besides bringing the scope of this dictionary within manageable limits, is of special value to those who are interested in a historical and scientific study of the Prākṛta languages. The meaning of each word is accurately defined in Sanskrit, Guzarati, Hindi and English and is supported by precise references. Though the English renderings are often inelegant and such as may well be improved, they bring out the sense correctly. The philological aspect of the Ardha Māgadhi language is totally ignored in the preparation of this dictionary and thus the scheme of this lexicographical endeavour with reference to the Ardha Māgadhi has been simplified to a large extent. The practical requirements of the students of Jaina literature are adequately met in this dictionary and it is not designed to be an encyclopædia similar to the mammoth work of Rājendravijaya—called the Abhidhānarājendra.

The devout divine Simon Browne (1680–1732) is said to have subjected himself to *Zoanthropy* when he was making a dictionary (vide page 1147—Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary).

The task of making a dictionary is exceedingly unpleasant and difficult. However it is not a *Zoanthrope* or *Dei-anthrope* that has made this Ardha Māgadhi Dictionary; but it is a matter on which all concerned may congratulate themselves that the huge task of preparing this dictionary has been luckily discharged in a satisfactory manner by the highly disciplined and esteemed Jaina scholar and saint Śatāvadhāni Muni Śri Ratnachandrāji Mahārāj, whose vast scholarship and experience may well be taken to be a guarantee of the trustworthiness and value of this important aid to the study of Jaina literature.

S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI.

THE FINANCIAL CONDITIONS AND OPERATIONS OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT, 1921–1930, by W. F. Willoughby. *Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institution 1931.*

This work by the Director of the Institution for Government Research, Brookings Institution, is a sequel to the same author's *The National Budget System* (1927), and deals with the system of financial administration obtaining in the Federal Government of the United States since the adoption of the Budget system in 1921. 'Though a great improvement in the methods of stating the public accounts has followed the adoption of the budget system, it is still difficult not only for the general public but also for those directly concerned with the conduct of the governmental affairs, readily to determine the facts regarding treasury resources and obligations and treasury receipts and expenditures. This arises in part from the inadequacy in the system of recording and reporting financial conditions and operations. The best financial statements require interpretation and analysis through derivative statements if the significance of their showings is to be made evident. Such an interpretation and analysis, moreover, can only be made on the basis of a knowledge of the accounting system by which the data contained in the published statements are accumulated and a familiarity with the more important changes that have taken place during the period covered in the revenue system of the Government and the activities engaged in by it.' This is the object which the author had clearly set before him and he has successfully fulfilled it. The period selected, viz. 1921 to 1930, is particularly suitable because it corresponds with the period during which the new budget system has been in operation, and because it excludes the abnormal conditions of the War period. The author not only describes the methods

of financial administration but also suggests improvements in the manner in which financial data are now given in the official reports. The book is thus a useful addition to the literature on public finance. The accounts of the Government of India are in greater need of elucidation than those of the U.S.A., and let us hope that some officer of the Indian Finance Department will draw up a similar book about the financial administration of India for the use of publicists and students.

P. G. T.

HISTORY OF PRE-MUSALMAN INDIA, VOL. I. *Prehistoric India*, by V. Rangacharya, M.A., Madras 1929. Price Rs. 5.

The spade of the archæologist at Harappa and Mohenjodaro, of which discoveries this book treats of in Chapter VII, has made it abundantly clear that the history of India does not begin with Alexander's invasion of the Punjab and that we must look for the commencement of the historical period many centuries before Alexander's march. If history proper does not consist in the dry bones of chronological data, and does consist in portraying a picture of the evolution of races and cultures, then its origins are enshrouded in a misty past, and much depends on the researches of the geologist and anthropologist, not to speak of the archæologist, in the removal of this mist. Prof. Rangacharya in this handy volume has essayed with success to collect together the results of investigations in the respective fields of ethnology, anthropology, geology and archæology, and present them to us with his dispassionate judgment. This able and learned work of the professor consisting of nine chapters, gives a succinct account of India's prehistoric period commencing with Azoic epoch, going through the eolithic, palæolithic, and neolithic ages as well as the age of metals. The concluding chapter is an introduction to the Vedic period of Ancient India, which forms the second volume of the projected series of nine volumes on Pre-Musalman India. The value of the book consists in that it 'provides the background in which the Vedic period of Indian History had its setting.' This is a much neglected field either because the materials are scanty or because its bearing on the history of India is not sufficiently recognised. One is at least glad to see that Mr. Rangacharya has recognised this aspect of the problem and realised its importance as preliminary to the study of India's history. The professor has done his task well and deserves our congratulations.

V. R. R.

THE STATISTICAL YEAR BOOK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS 1930–31.

This volume, which is a continuation of the International Statistical YEAR BOOK, 1929, gives the most up-to-date statistics of area and population (actual population, natural increase, migration movements, etc.), production (agricultural, mineral, industrial), trade, transport, public finance, exchange, prices, wages, unemployment, labour disputes, etc., etc.

The YEAR BOOK has been considerably expanded as compared with last year's edition, and now contains 121 different tables. Among the new tables added the following are of special interest at the present moment: unemployment by groups of industries, strikes and lock-outs; yield of bonds; index number of shares; discount rates of central banks; market rates of discount. The production tables have not only been increased in number but they have been supplemented in many cases by price quotations expressed in gold francs per metric unit.

In view of the fact that the phenomena of the economic depression are the object of general attention, a special effort has been made to give statistics as up to date as possible. The majority of the tables cover the year 1930 and most of the agricultural tables show the harvest of 1930–31. Similarly, some of the recent population censuses have been taken for calculating the world's population and the ratios of natural movement.

The YEAR BOOK contains, for the first time, several specially prepared geographical maps which show all the countries, with their possessions, etc., mentioned in the various tables.

To make the statistics of the YEAR BOOK easier to handle the usual detailed table of co-efficients for converting currencies, weight and measures have been expanded. There is a table for converting the currencies of 61 countries at par; a table for converting currencies at the rate of exchange ruling in 1930 and another giving the principal conversion co-efficients for metric weights and measures in use in the United States, the British Empire, Japan and Turkey. Finally, there is a table containing a number of conventional co-efficients for converting weight measures into those of capacity, and *vice versa.*

MEMORANDUM ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND BALANCES OF PAYMENTS 1927–1929. *Vol. II.*—Balances of Payments. Published by the League of Nations.

This is a collection of statements of the international payments of different countries up to 1929 inclusive and an introductory

chapter, which includes a study of recent events on the international capital market up to the end of 1930. In this study the connection which exists between share speculation in the United States and other lending countries and the recent disturbances in the international capital market is analysed in the light of available data concerning capital issues for domestic and foreign account, and detailed information is given with regard to gold movements and the movements of actual bond yields and money rates in different countries during and after the boom of 1928-29.

The table in which capital movements are summarised, shows how international capital movements contracted during the boom in the United States and elsewhere which preceded the present crisis. The United States net capital exports fell from $1,059 million in 1928 to 213 million in 1929. France discontinued her capital exports at the same time as she increased her imports of gold and goods. British capital exports did not fall off in 1929 but changed in nature; new issues for foreign account on the London market fell by about one-third and a large proportion of the capital outflow would appear to have represented short-term capital invested in New York or withdrawn from London by French lenders. In 1930, however, the British surplus on account of trade and other current transactions fell from £138 to £39 millions.

Germany reduced her borrowings in 1929 by one-half; in the same year, Canada became an importer of capital, Denmark, Yugoslavia and Japan exporters of capital and a number of other disturbances took place. Sweden, and not Germany, was the European country which borrowed most in New York in 1929 (the capital raised by Sweden was however re-lent to countries which could not raise funds themselves in New York at easy terms). The New York issues for the account of Canada and Sweden rose from $200 million in 1928 to $354 million in 1929, while those for the account of six of the largest borrowers in other years, namely, Germany, Japan, Australia, the Argentine, Brazil, and Columbia, fell from $620 million to $54 million.

The turn of the business cycle late in 1929 did not restore more normal conditions. There was a temporary reaction in the beginning of 1930, noticeable in an increase in the volume of new capital issues for foreign accounts and a temporary approach of money rates in lending and borrowing countries. From the middle of 1930, however, political complications in South America and elsewhere and various repercussions of the crisis were responsible for a general lack of confidence, and a further contraction of the flow of capital to lending countries took place, accompanied by large gold

movements, currency inflation in many countries and various trade disturbances.

The *Memorandum*, which is the only book of reference of its kind, brings together representative statements of international accounts, unpublished and published, for different countries. Most of the statements are official or semi-official, and many have been specially prepared. The volume contains also a number of private estimates. The complete statements give balances of international payments divided into two groups, 'Current items', and 'Capital items', specified according to their nature. Full information concerning the methods used in estimation are given in explanatory notes after the tables, and available data concerning outstanding international debts and assets, Government and private, ('International indebtedness'), are given at the end of each chapter. The chapter for the United Kingdom, for example, gives the official balance of payments account 'balance of trade' published in the Board of Trade Journal—a statement which is indeed far less complete than that available for most of the other countries—an analysis of new overseas issues in London (according to the Midland Bank statistics) and a summary of the recent inquiries concerning outstanding British investments abroad, undertaken by Sir Robert Kindersley and the *Economist.*

The statements are, so far as possible, arranged according to a common scheme, full details of which are given in the introductory chapter. When available, figures are shown for a number of years in order to allow comparison over a period of time. The arrangement and the use of a common terminology for all the statements removes one of the greatest difficulties for the uninitiated who wish to compare statements of different origin.

Besides countries for which estimates have been published in the two or three preceding issues of the Memorandum, figures are now given for Belgium, France, Mexico and Uruguay.

ACKNOWLEDGED WITH THANKS

Monthly Summary of the League of Nations.
Cambridge University Magazine.
Tamesis (University of Reading).
Calcutta Review.
Kerala Society's Journal.
Madras Agricultural Journal.
National College Magazine, Trichinopoly.
St. Thomas' College Magazine, Trichur.

CIVILISATION AS A CO-OPERATIVE ADVENTURE.

THE PRINCIPAL MILLER LECTURES, 1932.

BY

PROF. A. R. WADIA.

I deem it a great privilege to have been invited to deliver the Principal Miller Lectures this year and especially so, as they are linked up with the great name of Dr. Miller. Ever since I have been in South India I have come across many and many an old pupil of the Christian College, who never tire of speaking of their old college days and how they were taught and moulded by a principal, who felt it a mission of his life to impart to his alumni something of that vigour and catholicity which so marked his own character. From all that I have heard of him it is not difficult to picture a man with an impressive presence, an eloquent voice, a great driving power and above all a great heart, which knew no bounds of caste or creed and which gave generously both in love and money. His was the personality that built up the Christian College, where we are met today, and the ring of hostels which his genius and his generosity mostly created. In short by his life and his work he has perhaps a right to be considered one of those, who have most permanently impressed South India in general and Madras in particular with the stamp of their own permanent worth. I also gather that he was a man of very deep religious convictions, a man who saw the hand of God in the doings of history and was imbued with a firm conviction of the 'inner meaning of human history as disclosing the one increasing purpose that runs through the ages'. No wonder therefore, if his grateful pupil, Dewan Bahadur Sir Venkataratnam Naidu, made this the subject matter of the lectures he endowed to commemorate his revered guru.

The theme is great, but at first one is apt to lean towards a view like that of the brilliant but erratic thinker, Count Keyserling, when he says: 'History, like life, is a tragedy, an insoluble equation or a surd'. Round about us we see so much that is evil, so much that is revolting to all our

developed sensibilities, and in the pages of history we read over and over again the same old story of human greed and human cruelty, the hand of man raised against man and one evil succeeding another with shortlived interludes of great men and pleasing romances of love and life. And yet the question arises: Have we then lived in vain? Is life but a puppet show to keep the gods amused with our little tragedies and comedies? It is here that the philosopher comes in with his rationalising thought to wring out from nature and the record of men's doings their inner secret, some plan, some dominating idea, which could illuminate vast masses of arid facts. But in this very attempt he comes into conflict with the preserves of the pure historian, who will record facts and nothing but facts. He will dive deep into archives to shift and classify facts; he will unearth the buried cities of the dead past and label his discoveries of pots and coins as Sumerian or Cretan; he will classify the human skeletons as dolichocephalic or as mesocephalic. He will scrupulously record how Alexander the Great conquered the world and died at the age of thirty-three as the result of a drinking bout; how Cæsar saved Rome and yet died a victim of the assassin's dagger; how Napoleon, the most towering personality of his age, created an epoch, and yet died an exile; how Shah Jehan created a dream in marble and died a prisoner with his last gaze fixed on the immortal memorial of his mortal love.

The philosopher who has found the reign of matter or of mind as the case may be in the whole realm of nature will not submit to the brute contingency of history. A Hegel will insist on seeing the play of mind in all history and a Karl Marx will labour to prove how the whole history of man is dominated by his economic needs. The facts are the same, but the interpretations vary. A historian is content with the naked fact that Aurangzib was victorious over his brother Dara Shikoh, but the philosopher is apt to see in it a change of the whole destiny of India. The battle of Plassey does not merely mean the defeat of a Mahomedan prince, but the introduction of new forces in the life of India, the end of which we have yet to see. If this world is governed by God or pervaded by mind, history cannot be merely contingent. It must have some meaning, some plan which the

unrolling time slowly and obscurely unravels. It would be futile to conceal that in this task of interpreting the meaning of history the personal factor consciously or unconsciously colours the interpretations, for interpretation implies a certain definite standpoint, which in its turn implies a definite philosophy. Keyserling finds in socialism 'one of the bitterest enemies of culture that has ever appeared in history'. In the same socialism Karl Marx sees the fulfilment of human destiny. To the lover of freedom the French Revolution marks the beginning of a new chapter in human progress. To Spengler it marks the decline of the West. At bottom a philosophy of history has as much of truth as the general philosophical standpoint of the philosopher. To a non-Idealist Hegel's philosophy of history seems but a wasted effort, while even an Idealist will have to admit that Hegel's philosophy of history is dominated far too much by his inborn Prussianism. How else to explain such an extraordinary statement as this: 'The destiny of the German peoples is to be the bearers of the Christian principle. . . For the Christian world is the world of completion; the grand principle of being is realised, consequently the end of days is fully come'. And these words were uttered when just four years earlier the guns had boomed at Waterloo and Europe was in the welter of confusion.

I am sure you will appreciate the difficulties which confront a man who would seek to fathom the one increasing purpose in human history. I have no doubt that this increasing purpose has been there right through, and I shall try to carry you with me in my conviction, but not unless you agree with me as to the standpoint to be adopted. My philosophical standpoint is definitely idealistic: Reality is spiritual and in the world of our experience this spirituality expresses itself best in the world of human souls. Men may differ from one another in the range of their capacities, but it is the birthright of each human soul to realise itself and a human society is good or bad to the degree to which it enables each constituent member of it to fulfil his humanity. This is democracy in its broadest sense. It is not a mere matter of political machinery, of votes and electorates, but of the conditions under which man can become what he has

it in him to become. That is why under an Asoka or an Akbar, under a Napoleon or a Mussolini men may be enjoying real liberty more than under a corrupt and mediocre political democracy. This great ideal of human democracy is the common inheritance of all great religions. Zoroaster preached it, Buddha lived it, Christ even died for it, Mahomed fought for it. Their message lives. But it has had to meet the opposition of all the petty conquerors of the day. The Aryan and the non-Aryan, the Brahmin and the Sudra, the Jew and the Gentile, the Greek and the barbarian, the Christian and the heathen, the white and the black—these are some of the great divisions that have rent mankind asunder and left their impress on social institutions, on literature and philosophy, on our ethics and politics. In a sense it is true that history knows no chosen people, and yet it is a truth which is hard to be realised by those whom force or circumstances have placed in a position to command and domineer. The humanity of man has again and again been negated by the arrogance of the conquering sword. Goethe with his clear vision could epitomise the whole teaching of the prophets in a crystal-clear couplet:

> 'Was ist das Heigligste? Das was heut' und ewig die Geister
> Tief und tiefer gefühlt, immer nur einiger macht'.[1]

And yet men have been woefully slow to learn this lesson. In our cool moments it seems to illuminate the very depths of our being, and yet there comes a blast of racialism, of economic rivalry, of political exploitation, of international jealousy, and the unity of mankind evaporates into a mere myth. But nature has her own cunning to prove the equality of men and few passages have left a deeper impress on my mind than that episode of the poor Irish widow recounted by Carlyle in his *Past and Present*. There she was, this poor Irish widow in the city of Edinburgh, going from door to door with her three children begging for help, but receiving none. Then in despair she sank down, a victim to typhus-fever. She died, but not without infecting seventeen people in that lane, who too died.

[1] 'What is the holiest? That which to-day and always the spirit of man has felt deep and deeper, that which will always make men more and more one'.

And Carlyle continues: 'The forlorn Irish widow applies to her fellow-creatures, as if saying, "Behold I am sinking bare of help: ye must help me. I am your sister, bone of your bone; one God made us; ye must help me". They answer "No, impossible thou art no sister of ours". But she proves her sisterhood; her typhus fever kills them; they actually were her brothers, though denying it'. Any comment is superfluous.

Philosophers of history have conceived this one increasing purpose in various ways. Hegel has conceived it in terms of freedom; Auguste Comte in terms of science; Benjamin Kid in terms of character; Herbert Spencer in terms of industrialism. And so the list goes on. But all these are mere aspects, mere facets of one humanity. Man is complex. As the Upanishads long ago realised, man is not merely a creature that lives to eat and drink. He has his varied economic wants, but he has a soul which hungers for beauty and creates the whole world of art and literature. He has an intellect, which aspires to penetrate every nook and corner of nature and wring out its secret whether from the deepest bowels of the earth or the highest vaults of the sky, and thus he builds up science. Behind the phenomena of science lies the deeper creative mystery of the universe which the prophet and the philosopher seek to penetrate. What a vast range of activities and how futile it is to compass it within the narrow bounds of any one formula! The greatest men have never been able to envisage more than some one or two aspects of life. Many minds have worked in the course of ages to build up our rich heritage of art and agriculture and commerce, science, philosophy and religion. And which nation can truthfully say: all this is our work? It is a vain boast. At various epochs various different peoples have felt the divine afflatus and built up varied civilisations. When a good thing has been ushered into existence other people have never hesitated to borrow and to profit. And those who have been slow to learn have been left behind in the march of time. Humanity is greater than the greatest nation. It is a world-wide co-operative body made up of many nations, each with its quota of contribution and each with a sense of pride can say: we too have done our bit in this great field of humanity. The Chinese

and the Mughals, the Iranians and the Indians, the Jews and the Arabs, the Egyptians and the Europeans have all played a living part in human history. One name we miss in this list: the unfortunate negro. Is he indeed the eternal pariah of history? Has he nothing to his credit? Perhaps nothing comparable to the contribution of others. Or if he was ever great, it is a secret buried under the debris of ages. In the historic period the negro has played but the part of a humble exploited slave. But consider his history in the last seventy years and it would be wise to desist from speaking of him with contempt. Born in his native Africa, cut off from the civilizing influence of the Mediterranean by the desert of Sahara, cut off from the east and west by wide interminable seas, they were hemmed in and they remained in barbarous isolation till the more daring and the more adventurous Asiatic or European drew him away from his native home and forced him into slavery. And so it continued through centuries till Abraham Lincoln, one of the most towering peaks in human history, fought their battle and set them free. Since then in spite of segregations and lynchings they have grown to a certain height, producing a Booker Washington, producing a long array of able lawyers and doctors, preachers and teachers. What wonderful vitality there must be in these people that in spite of their almost inhuman misfortunes they have preserved intact their spirit of song and dance and to-day the fashionable salons of New York Paris, Berlin and London are content to import their latest dances and music from the despised negro. What religious vitality they must be having to preserve their faith in God and set a new standard of religious poetry in their famous negro pastorals! Even Gobineau, the prophet of bigoted Nordic racialism, is constrained to admit 'Artistic genius equally foreign to each of the three main types, has arisen only in consequence of the marriage of whites with the blacks'. This is the same Gobineau who believes in the whites as the 'great and noble race' and bemoans its deterioration by dilution with the blood of the black, brown, yellow or red. Given a chance the negro has shown what he can do. And so even he is by no means outside the pale of civilised humanity. This is what I mean when I speak of civilisation as co-operative. The

burden of human progress is too heavy, too responsible to be borne by the shoulders of any one race or any one country. The pace of progress may vary from country to country and from epoch to epoch, but mankind cannot rest until all humanity come up to that level when the beauties of the earth and the treasures of human achievements are the heritage of all. Truly was Buddha great when he said that he wanted enlightenment so that he might enlighten all. It was this spirit that made Asoka the greatest royal missionary the world has ever seen. It was the same spirit that actuated Sri Suryavamsa Rama, a king of Siam in the fourteenth century, when entering the Buddhist order he 'solemnly declared his hope that the merit thus acquired might make him in future live not an Emperor, an Indra or a Brahma but a Buddha able to save mankind'[1]

When I speak of civilization as an adventure I mean that it cannot be conceived as something which is foreordained, as a sort of mechanical contrivance which goes its own allotted way, merely making use of human beings as pawns in the chess of life. We find the deterministic or fatalistic view elaborated not merely by the socialist-materialists like Karl Marx and Bukharin, but also by so vehement an exponent of culture and spirit as Spengler. Hence the note of pessimism that runs through the massive volumes of Spengler. 'The Civilisation is the inevitable *destiny* of the Culture . . . . Civilisations are the most external and artificial states of which a species of developed humanity is capable. They are a conclusion, the thing-become succeeding the thing-becoming, death following life, rigidity following expansion, intellectual age and the stone-built, petrifying world-city following mother-earth and the spiritual childhood of Doric and Gothic. They are an end, irrecoverable, yet by inward necessity reached again and again'. Thus speaks Spengler. Is his the voice of defeated Prussian Jingoism, of a profound distrust of human nature, of a fear that nothing precious can be shared without its ceasing to be precious? Spengler has shown monumental learning in the support of his thesis, but it would take up long to follow him step by step and futile too, for if I succeed in carrying you with me in the thesis that I have in mind, that

[1]Sir Charles Elliot's *Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol. III, p. 83.

would carry with it a refutation of the view that history is not a free, but a shackled process. History is creative of new values at every stage, but just because it is a free process, it has to struggle for their establishment against old vested interests and old conservative forces. It would be a mistake to imagine that this struggle happens only in the spheres of religion or of politics. On the contrary it is coeval with every department of human activity: in the world of art, literature and science as much as in the world of economics, religion and politics except that heads are not so copiously broken in the former as in the latter. If success were assured, it would not be so enjoyable. It might even lead to a fatalistic lethargy, which would effectually stand in the way of progress. It is the uncertainty of success and the certainty of opposition that give a zest to life: the zest of the reformer who feels that the future is on his side, the enthusiasm that makes him resolute in the face of ridicule and of obloquy, the cheerfulness that makes him greet imprisonment and even death itself as an immortal friend for the posterity to make epics of and to treasure up their sufferings as beacon-lights to guide their faltering steps. That is adventure. Only cowards count on an easy success and compromise with their consciences at the first breath of opposition. The heroes command success, and if they fail they are content to die for their convictions trusting time to show their work in its true perspective.

Now that I have made my standpoint clear, it is for me to show that history endorses my thesis. I have already admitted that if a man is inclined to be a pessimist, history will afford him copious material. In every age the protagonists of the settled order see in every change the beginning of social dissolution. It is very difficult for the persons who are hard hit by a change to realise that the change may after all be for the better from the standpoint of the whole society. More than this, the folklore of all countries delights in picturing a golden age, when things were always better and men were angels and rivers were of milk and ambrosia. Even Rousseau consoled himself with visions of the noble savage, who never had an existence outside the pages of his books. The Hindu chronology finds in this *Kali yuga* a good scapegoat for the sins and follies of mankind.

From this standpoint history as we know it can be nothing but a story of progressive degeneration. But mythology apart, taking our stand on the sober truth of science as found in biology since the days of Darwin and Wallace, we would do well not to brood on our present deficiencies, many and painful though they be, but to consider how humble our origin was and how through countless ages, which go far beyond any written records that we possess, we have achieved bit by bit our present estate. How distressing is it to come across pictures of naked savages in the heart of Africa or Australia in this year of grace 1932! And yet that nakedness represents a stage through which the ancestors of the most civilised races of to-day had to pass. Moving about in hordes like the modern gorillas and chimpanzees, our Australopithecus and Neanderthal ancestors roamed about without the burden of anything which they could call their own. Living on fruits and herbs, in continuous peril of being devoured by their powerful animal neighbours of the forests or the plains, shivering in cold and dying as animals do even to-day, uncared for and leaving no traces of their existence except buried fossils to puzzle the zoologists and the anthropologists of our times, these primitive ancestors of ours lived, ignorant of the great destiny that awaited the children of their loins. All this belongs to anthropology. Many things are uncertain in this science, but we are certain how through the unknown millenia man made good his ascent till he came to discover the use of fire and the art of agriculture. Scattered wandering nomadic tribes in course of time settled down on some inviting soil, where water and climate were alike merciful, and that explains how the field of human history for some ten thousand years of the historic period was circumscribed within the northern hemisphere and this too practically between 20 and 60 degrees of northern latitude. That our ancestors fought hard just as their descendants do to-day is not to be doubted. Whether to defend themselves better or to secure better amenities for themselves by taking the offensive, tribes thought it prudent to form confederations and aided by agriculture, these confederations came to develop into city-states and these developed into kingdoms and even empires, though of a very loose type, which meant more the spheres of raiding than of settled

permanent occupation. This is indeed a very rapid summary of human ascent from barbarism, but it brings us upto the historic period of what we call the ancient civilisations.

It would be a most interesting thing to find out which race or which country had the honour of initiating the very first human civilisation. But I wonder if we shall ever be in a position to discover this buried secret of the past. Historians are divided among themselves and we have to rest content with this that by the time recorded history begins there were four great civilisations: the Chinese, the Babylonian, the Egyptian and the Indian-Dravidian. The first was definitely the handiwork of the yellow race, the second and the third of the white race, while the exact paternity of the Dravidian civilisation is still a conundrum of history. Subsequent to these primary civilisations we have the emergence of the East Mediterranean civilisations of Crete and Phoenicia, the Judaic, the Iranian and the Indo-Aryan or the Hindu. Still later we have the Graeco-Roman and the Christian, the Saracenic and the modern European civilisations.

In the reconstruction of these great early civilisations archaeology has played a part which cannot be overemphasised, and yet it has had to work under very severe limitations and therefore the reconstructions and the conclusions of the archaeologists are by no means above doubt, in fact in many cases they have all the interest and the elusiveness of romances. But there are a few general statements which may be legitimately deduced from the vast panorama of early history. They do not hold of merely isolated races or isolated tracts of land, but they are true of human history in extenso and it is only on this ground that they can be said to be truly universal in character.

I. *Growth of Civilisation through Trade and Wealth.*— Men were able to rise above their animal origin only when they had attained a stage of development, when they were no more under the need of moving about in search of food. The discovery of agriculture was the first assertion of the humanity of men, for thereby they ceased to be nomadic and developed a territorial love. Hence it is not surprising that the earliest civilisations were all riparian in character. With the production of surplus food there came into existence

trade, with trade came wealth and development of new wants like rich clothes and vessels and new implements of warfare, the marvellous discovery of the art of writing, which seems to have developed on independent lines in all the four earliest civilisations. From all this we might justifiably deduce that men were civilised, when they commanded wealth and leisure and when they were sufficiently disciplined to lead a common life under the rule of a government. It implies the capacity of a number of men to live together, to sink their individual anti-social proclivities and develop a common life, a common outlook, and to face dangers in the defence of their common interests. Such a civilised state could have become possible only through generations of tribal discipline, the only logical outcome of which was the emergence of the state.

II. *Growth of Civilisation through War.*—War has been coeval with humanity and the early history of men is first and foremost a history of wars. In their ignorance as well as in their exclusiveness war was a useful means of bringing men of alien stocks nearer one another, and such a contact, making allowance for all the inevitable bloodshed, was a prelude to that enormous intermixture of blood, which has made ethnology so baffling a science to-day. Mesopotamia, the basin of the Tigris and the Euphrates, was literally the melting pot of the ancient world. The Sumerians and the Akadians, the Assyrians and the Chaldeans, the Medes and the Persians, as well as the Hebrews and the Greeks in the course of five thousand years and more have lived in this region, intermarried and overcome the sense of the superior and the inferior. The unifying effect of living together under a common rule is marvellous and is well brought out in more than one instance. We hear a good deal from the western writers about the great patriotism of the Greeks and how they repelled the rising surge of Persian power and ultimately laid it low at Arbela. But we are apt to overlook the fact that many Greeks had found service under the Persian king, and Alexander encountered sturdy resistance from the Greek soldiers in the Persian army. As Hegel was constrained to admit, the yoke of the Persians sat light on the numerous peoples that made up the heterogeneous Persian Empire from the days of Cyrus the Great onwards.

In India we find the same phenomenon. Hindu Law as well as the epics bear testimony to the view that the conquering Aryans took many a wife from the conquered Dravidas and the marriage rigour of the caste system as we know it today is a matter of comparatively recent growth. The freedom of the marriage relations as we come across them in the epics is of the most surprising variety. Santanu, the king of Hastinapura, wedded a fisher woman, Satyavati by name. Bhima married a Rakshasi, Hidimbi. Arjuna married a Naga princess. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar in his learned paper on the Foreign Elements in Hindu Population[1] shows that there is hardly a caste or class in India which has not a foreign strain in it and that there is an admixture of foreign blood not only among the Rajputs and the Marathas, but even amongst the Brahmins. The Punjab, which has borne the shocks of successive foreign invasions, bears the stamp of a heterogeneous population more perhaps than any other portion of India.

In the last few centuries the European domination in the different parts of the world has led to an enormous miscegenation, the result of which we see in the Eurasians of India and the Mulattoes of America and Africa. Even the Mongolian China shows many an Aryanised face, pointing to foreign blood, while the last war in Europe once again brought out war's levelling tendencies towards miscegenation. Daniel Defoe's satirical poem *The Englishman* beautifully brings out the futility of the boast of purity of blood. Men and women of the most diverse races tend to come together, and give rise to new stocks. In short racial miscegenation has been the invariable result of war and this practically means of the whole human history.

We in India to-day have very legitimate reasons to be distrustful of the blatant imperialism of Europe, but we cannot get over the fact that in human history imperialism has been the normal order, and civilisation has spread over vast areas mainly as the result of imperialism. China in the Far East could not have become a huge empire but for the steady pressure of her arms at various periods. Hindu India

[1] *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XL.

in her palmiest days not merely saw the imperialism of Chandragupta and Harsha, but the exuberance of her intellect carried Hindu civilisation far beyond the confines of India. The Burmese chronicles themselves record the foundation of Tagaung by the Hindu prince Abhiraja in the ninth century B.C. and the kingdom of Arakan claims as its ruler a prince of ancient Benares. In his book on the Hindu Colony of Champa, the modern Annam, Dr. R. C. Majumdar has pointed out the existence of a good many Hindu kingdoms even in the interior of Indo-China, and supports the view that 'a double stream of emigrants from India flowed into Indo-China at a very early period' viz. by land and sea, *founding kingdoms in Champa and Kamboja* (Cambodia), in Sumatra and Java, in Borneo and Bali. America of to-day is dotted with places with European names, and similarly the Hindu colonists named their new homes after such celebrated old names as Ayodhya, Kausambi, Dvaravati, Mathura, Champa, Kallinga, Kamboja, and Gandhara. He would be a bold man who would venture to say that this colonisation was effected altogether peacefully. Details of original conquests are lacking, but the methods which were followed in India and are usually associated with imperialism could not but have been followed. Even if it were a policy of 'peaceful penetration' we know what it has meant in more recent centuries. When I say this, I should not be understood as being critical, for I believe that conquest has been one means of spreading a superior civilisation and India in her day played the role, and played it manfully to fulfil the destiny that was India's.

Imperialism as a policy of active aggrandisement has played a far more important part in the West beginning with Persia. In an age when there was apt to be too much of free and desultory fighting, a strong power, keeping the warring nations from fighting and preserving peace over a wide area, was a cultural as much as a political necessity. The Greek civilisation was very peculiar in its intense desire to maintain the polity of the city state. Plato, the philosopher of the city state, has no enthusiasm or word of admiration for Pericles and his imperialism, while the modern historian of ancient Greece knows no bounds in his admiration for him

as the symbol of Greek civilisation at its best. Demosthenes raved against the dominance of Philip of Macedon, but the muse of history recognises in him merely the voice of a lost cause. The civilisation of the Greek city state undoubtedly justified itself, but it remained narrow: essentially a civilisation of the city walls. If the good in it was not to perish by an internal decay, it had to spread, and spread it did through that youthful genius Alexander the Great. Of its cultural implications, I shall speak a little later. At this moment it is of importance to note that Greek imperialism was responsible for the spread of Greek culture eastwards, and yet it was no one-sided bargain, for the Greeks too had to learn and unlearn many things. It is on record that the earliest western conqueror of India was impressed by the placidity of Brahminism in the Punjab and felt that in the realm of spirit the West must learn from the East.

The glory of the Grecian arms in the East proved to be the prelude to its extinction before the might of Rome, but in Rome—in spite of the lugubrations of Spengler—the glory of Greece lived and still lives. If the native Greek was too contemptuous of the barbarian to civilise him, the force of circumstances made him the civiliser of Europe against his will, and none but a perverse aristocrat will see in this Roman imperialism anything but that which laid the foundations of the Europe of to-day.

Since the days of the Roman Empire two other imperialisms have played a great part in the history of the world: the Saracenic and the modern European. Persia for varied reasons was unable to withstand the fierce onslaught of the desert Arabs fired with a new religious zeal, and Ctesiphon, where the magnificent arch of the Persian Palace still stands as a mute witness of departed glory, passed into strangers' hands. But as the cunning of the Time Spirit again and again has shown, this defeat was a prelude to the creation of a new power: the Saracenic, which was really a union of the Arab vigour and Persian brains and this combination dominated the world for several centuries. It not merely made Western Asia regain the glory of the days of Cyrus and Darius, but made it the centre of the world of culture from which Europe was willing to learn. In fact Europe was

saved by the Saracenic culture from the dangers of an insidious barbarism which under the mask of religion was corroding her intellectual life. The European imperialism of the last four centuries has had a remarkable development and opened out immense possibilities of great world movements, to which I shall refer in my second lecture.

III. *Growth of Civilisation through Religion.*—If the greater and greater unity of mankind has been on the one hand realised through the force of arms, it has been even more potently realised through the peaceful and persuasive force of religion. Apart from the primitive communities in Africa and Australia and other outlying parts of the world, the religious classification of mankind to-day does not present any great complexity. We may proceed from the generally accepted view that Central Asia set the ball of religious advance rolling. The worship of Isis in Egypt and of Marduk in Babylonia has died away, but the spiritual impulse that issued in the Vedas of the Hindus and the Gathas of the Persians have been practically the fountain heads of all subsequent religious development in two distinct streams: one comprising India and Eastern Asia generally, the other comprising Western Asia and Europe-America.

The Vedas represent the religion of nature worship practised by the Aryans in their original home in central Asia and after their advent into India they underwent a steady philosophical development, whose purest expression we find in the Upanishads. While in the course of centuries the Vedic religion has suffered heavily through the inroads of Dravidian and other alien practices, it still remains true that the Vedas find their logical completion in the Upanishads, which in their turn have been the inspiration of the main currents of Indian philosophic thought, particularly Vedanta. But the Vedic religion suffered from the growing rigour of castes and extreme ritualism, necessitating the great reform movements of Mahavir and Buddha. While the religion of Mahavir has always been confined to the frontiers of India, and is just one among others of the many religions that subsist in India to-day, the religion of Buddha has become a world religion. Though I am not prepared to accept that all Chinese are Buddhists, it still remains true that its spiritual

vitality is unimpaired. Buddha is out and out the greatest contribution of India to the world. His life and his ethical vigour were the means of uplifting the lowliest to a realisation of the spiritual in them and proved a great fructifying source of religious life. The palmiest days of Indian history coincide with the dominance of Buddhism in India. If India has any right to boast that she has given of her best for the betterment of the world without shedding a single drop of human blood, it is only because of the Buddhist conquest of Asia. Dr. James Pratt, who has been such a devoted student of Buddhism both as a theory and as a practice, is perfectly justified in emphasising its great elasticity and adaptability. 'Its transplanting to new lands', says he, 'has been accomplished never through conquest or through migration but solely by the spread of ideas. Yet almost everywhere it has gone it has so completely adapted itself to the new people and the new land as to become practically a national religion'. This is what gives such a vital interest to Buddhism in its various environments and this is what makes Sir Charles Eliot's study of Buddhism in the different countries of eastern and southern Asia of such fascinating interest.

But our admiration for Buddhism need not lead us to any exaggeration of the just measure of its influence. We in India as well as the Europeans in general are apt to dub all China and Japan as Buddhist, while in truth Buddhism has been just one of the three dominant influences in China as well as of the two in Japan. The thinker of China par excellence was Confucius, who was not a prophet, but a great law-giver, and very luckily for China a really democratic one. The social instincts of the Chinese are exceptionally strong and the cultured classes through centuries have been first and foremost Confucians. But Confucianism is weak on the purely religious side and it is this weakness which was overcome by the introduction of Buddhism. Buddha himself did not preach about God, but his followers made him a god as much as the Christians have made Christ a god. It gave an outlet for the all too human desire to worship and yet it did not come into any actual conflict with Confucianism, for both were essentially democratic. The Emperor Wan-li, it is no wonder, saw this clearly when he compared Buddhism and Confucianism

to the two wings of a bird, and they have remained two wings of a bird right down till our own times. Great teachings are apt to be corrupted through an ignorant and avaricious priesthood. No religion has escaped the petrifying hand of priesthood, and Buddhism has been no exception, but nobody has dared to sully the one pure teaching of Buddha: that he lived for the enlightenment of all. Both by the virtue of Buddha's life and of his abiding love for the meanest creature Buddhism developed into the worship of Buddha: the philosophic Hinnayana gave place to Mahayana.

It is possible to trace the philosophical genealogy of Buddha's teaching to the speculations of the Upanishadic seers, but Buddha in his ethical intensity has far transcended the aristocratic constitution of Hinduism. It had a great period in India, but it was eventually driven out of India, unfortunately to the loss of India. It remains a paradox that the stream which rose in India and fructified the spiritual pastures of the Chinese Empire has run dry at its source. But the paradox is explicable. The democracy of Buddha found no irreconcilable rival in Confucianism and so found a hospitable home in China, while in India itself it had to overcome the inborn stubborn pride of the Aryans, which had crystallised itself into a more or less rigorous caste system. As the vigour of pristine Buddhism declined in India, caste once again asserted itself and Buddhism became an exile. Some years ago I was travelling from Cawnpore to Bombay and I had a Mahomedan fellow passenger whose words are still ringing in my ears. 'All the misfortunes of India', he said, 'are due to the fact that India has driven out Buddha'. The more I think the more I feel inclined to agree with him. Japan has grown to be a power, even China has been able to show her vitality. The caste-ridden India has been the perennial magnet to attract one invader after another.

Retracing our steps to the ancient religious watershed of Central Asia, we come across the beginnings of the other stream which has enriched the religious life of Western Asia and Europe. I believe both on linguistic and historical grounds that some type of Vedic religion was the common faith of the ancient Hindus and the ancient Iranians. But the same reasons, which gave birth to the ethical revolt of

Buddha against the Vedas, necessitated an ethical revolt in Iran and the leader of this revolt was Zarathustra or to use the more common Europeanised form : Zoroaster. As against the philosophical and ascetic tone of Buddha's reform, Zoroaster, who preceded Buddha by several centuries, if not by a thousand years, definitely from the first evolved monotheism of the purest type. This claim is likely to be challenged on the ground that Moses antedated Zoroaster. Zoroaster's date is still a mooted problem among scholars, but the general opinion converges round 1000 B.C., while the date of Moses is placed in the 14th century B.C. I need hardly say that Biblical scholarship itself has shown that the events relating to Moses were compiled centuries after him and therefore his date cannot be taken as a settled fact. But for the particular point that I have to establish it is immaterial whether Moses lived after or before Zoroaster. For it is admitted that if Moses developed the conception of Yahweh as one God, Yahweh was fundamentally conceived as the God of the Jews and the whole conception of the Jews as the chosen people of God is linked up with the tribal nature of Yahweh. As against this even in spite of the shadowy figure of Zoroaster and all the uncertainties of his historical environment we have in his sacred Gathas a clear enunciation of Ahura Mazda as the one and only God of Righteousness. I can hear some one asking me whether Zoroaster was not really dualistic rather than monotheistic? The fact is that the dualism of good and evil, which we find so clearly in the Gathas is just an attempt to solve the problem of evil and it does not affect the ultimate supremacy or the sovereign divinity of Ahura Mazda himself. Far from this dualism being peculiar to Zoroaster, it has since his time become the common inheritance of all theistic religions and all theistic philosophies. In Plato's *Republic* we have the same idea that God can be only righteous and no evil can be attributed to Him, and if evil exists it must fall outside of Him and to that extent dualism is inevitable. The important part played by Satan both in the Old Testament as well as in the New and in Christian Theology and the acceptance of the concept in the Koran go far to show that the lines laid down by Zoroaster were fundamentally sound, for that is

the only way in which the righteousness of God can be saved, though at the expense of his omnipotence. If God is really good, why did he create evil? To discuss this question would itself take up a long time and this is not the place for it, and yet it is interesting to note that in some current philosophical theisms of our own day the limitedness or the finitude of God are emphasised more and more so as to safeguard the essential goodness of God.

The significance of Zoroaster's teaching comes out in the history of the Persian Empire, particularly under Cyrus and Darius. With the spread of the Persian Empire it was inevitable that Zoroastrianism should also spread, and yet it was not generally a matter of compulsion, for under the symbol of light the Persian inheritance of truth by itself permeated the empire, as even Hegel admits. And Judaea was no exception to the rule. It is noteworthy that so stiff-necked a people as the Jews are generally supposed to have been should have owed the reestablishment of their temple at Jerusalem to the clear-spirited tolerance of Cyrus. And it was a great tribute and a recognition of the Persian influence that in the Book of Isaiah, Cyrus should be mentioned as the anointed of the Lord and as the chosen instrument of God. The Behistun inscriptions of Darius show behind all the egoism of a great conqueror a piety which centres round Ahura Mazda and a hatred of Druj, the lie or the evil mind.

How Judaism took up the ethical zest of their conquerors is immortalised in the pages of the Jewish prophets and how the conception of the immortality of soul slowly dawned on them long after it had found a home in the Persian religion has all been sufficiently recognised by Christian authors like Dr. Mills and others. How Judaism developed into Christianity and how both contributed to the rise of Islam are more recent facts and better known and so we can afford not to dwell at length upon them. But there is one phase which is not so well known and so I shall refer to it, as it is a further proof of my general thesis. During the indecisive wars which were waged between Rome and Persia plenty of opportunities were afforded to both sides to learn from each other, and the Roman legionaries in spite of all their enthusiasm for the Capitoline Jupiter and the worship of their Emperor, were

captivated by the religious spirit of the East, and long before Christ conquered Rome, Mithraism had found a hospitable home in imperial Rome. Mithraism was a corrupt form of Zoroastrianism and there was not a part of the Roman Empire which was free from its influence, including even the far-off Britain. It illustrates how people given opportunities of contact, whether through peace or war, are willing to learn and profit through alien forces. Mithraism at its worst was nobler than the wooden religion of the ancient Romans and if Mithraism had to yield to another religion it was better that it should have yielded to Christianity, which came with a rich heritage of centuries nurtured by the ethical idealism of Zoroaster and the Hebrew prophets.

Islam spread fast in Arabia and the Persian Empire for much the same reason that Mithraism had to yield place to Christianity in Europe. It has made slow progress in India because its democracy has had to meet the same difficulties that the native Buddhism had failed to overcome. But it has had a tremendous vogue in the wilds of Africa and is entitled to rank as a great civilising force in the history of humanity.

IV. *The Growth of Civilisation through Culture.*—It is necessary to distinguish between the religion and the culture of a people. It is true that the two are very closely interconnected, for a dominant religion never fails to create its own culture, and yet there is a certain definite difference between the two which cannot be overlooked. Perhaps a few concrete instances will better explain what I have in mind. In China we have already seen that Buddhism as a religion has lived side by side with Confucianism, which is not a religion, but essentially a culture. In Europe it is not difficult to see that the Graeco-Roman civilisation has furnished the essential ground plan, on which Christianity as a religion has been sought to be grafted, and in spite of what orthodox Christians might say to the contrary it is an open question whether Europe is fundamentally more Christian or more just European! Last year Lord Irwin gave one of his usually sympathetic addresses on India and the next day an eminent peer wrote a letter to the *Times* suggesting that it would have been better if Lord Irwin had been sent out to India ten years ago as a bishop rather than as a viceroy. I am not acquainted with

his lordship's religious convictions, but it would be futile to deny that 'Christians' of his type have not been uncommon in England. Is this Christianity or a species of that Roman imperialism which created a desert and called it peace? In the Saracenic civilisation it is easy to distinguish the religion of Mahomed and the great cultural contribution of the Persians converted to Islam. It is only in Hinduism that it is difficult to distinguish between its religious and cultural aspects.

There is a very practical need for distinguishing between the two, for in the complex nature of man there is an oscillation between this-worldliness, which is represented by culture, and the other-worldliness which is represented by religion at its highest. The former emphasises the beauty and the glamour of nature, the romance of love, the creativeness of art, the zest of knowledge, the lure of power. The latter emphasises majesty and yet the fatherliness of God, the supreme value of life as essentially supramundane; if not always, it often tends to depreciate the goods of this life and thus gives an ascetic tinge to the life of man. These two are such distinguishable aspects that with the exception of Mahomed, who was both a soldier and a prophet, we find that men who distinguish themselves in one of the aspects are painfully lacking in the other. Our imperialists, artists, statesmen do not figure as saints, while our greatest saints in their enthusiasm for the holy do not take sufficient count of human nature, and make well nigh impossible demands on the loyalty of their followers. Is it necessary to illustrate this, when every page of history is redolent of this great conflict? The divorce between a religion as it is preached and as it is practised, which is so painful a feature of every religion without any exception, finds its explanation in the dual demands of our nature. Some great souls have the requisite strength and inner vision, which make them uphold the demands of this life and of the other life beyond with some balance, but the rank and file find it easier to maintain an unreconciled dualism between the Sunday and the week-day morality, between the prayer in the mosque and the life outside, between the thought of universal philosophy and the practice of caste religion. And so the world has gone on. That is why the eras of great creative activity

appear to be the work of Satan to the conscience of the religious recluse, and the eras of religious piety appear so dull and drab to the man whose soul hungers for living beauty.

I have already had occasion to point out before that human nature is very complex and every attempt to reduce it to some simple formula, even though it be of the most profoundly religious character, is doomed to failure. That is why religion and culture somehow tend to live together in an unstable equilibrium, but by the very virtue of their contact religion supplies themes for culture to live on. I shall now proceed to develop this phase of human history, which is of an entrancing interest. Religion at its highest is essentially democratic, for the religious teacher is humble as being merely the instrument of the divine will, but the artist, the philosopher, the poet, the statesman, the general have the consciousness of being the superior ones in the world of mediocrities. Both need each other; neither can do without the other. Religion without its cultural habiliments would remain too abstract; culture without a religious inspiration would not rise to its full stature.

Beginning with India we find how the Hindu epics have woven themselves round the divine incarnations of Rama and Krishna and how the Hindu idolatry has been responsible for some of the most superb temples as well as sculpture, and yet the wish to make religion as concrete as possible has led to those pornographic representations which give a shock to the purely religious as in the temple of Jaganath at Puri and elsewhere on a smaller scale. Even the ascetic Buddhism has left behind the finest specimens of Indian painting at Ajanta, a living source of inspiration to our artists even to-day. Hindu art accompanied the Hindu colonists that left for distant lands from Broach on the west coast as well as from the east coast near the present day Masulipatam. It has come to me as an astounding revelation that Java and Indo-China contain specimens of Hindu architecture far surpassing anything to be found in India to-day, great though the Hindu architecture is in India itself. The magnificent proportions of the Angkor Vat temple of Indo-China as seen even in its copy at the Paris Colonial Exhibition last year have left behind impressions on the fortunate visitors which time will not efface, while the glorious

Boro Buddur in Java shows the intertwining of the Hindu and Buddhist motifs in a temple essentially Buddhist.[1] Mr. Scheltema points out how in Java Saivism and Buddhism flourished side by side and how 'the statues of the Dhyani Buddhas partook of Siva's attributes; those of their sons the Boddhisatvas, the Buddhas in evolution and of their saktis, showed the characteristics of other Hindu gods and goddesses. Siva conversely assumed the features of Avalokiteswara or Padmapani the Buddhist Lord of the world.' Similarly the Saivite temples of Prambanan have representations of enthroned Boddhisatvas.

The spread of Buddhism in the Far East gave a fillip to wholesale translation of Sanskrit books on Buddhism into the eastern languages especially Chinese. The researches of my friend and colleague Prof. Shustery have brought to light the interesting fact that in the dissemination of Buddhist knowledge in China even Iranians played a great part. Many Iranians had become Buddhists, including an heir apparent to the Parthian throne, who came to India, studied *Sutra Pataka* and *Abhi-Dharma* till he could repeat them by heart and then went to China and translated Buddhist works into Chinese under the name of Au Shi Kav or Au Tsing.

Not merely did the Indian art find a new home beyond the confines of India. Sanskrit also found a new home. Dr. Majumdar records: 'It is evident from the published inscription that at least up to the end of the tenth century A. D. the classical Sanskrit literature, particularly the Kavya, was thoroughly studied, probably even to the exclusion of the native literature if there were any. Sanskrit became the language of the learned and the indigenous tongue suffered a cold neglect. Not only were Indian books imported and studied, but even new books were written in Sanskrit, and the name of at least one such book and an extract from it has reached us'. This is with reference to Champa, but the same holds true of the other countries too, where Hindu civilisation came to be transplanted. Burma and Siam even to-day bear the stamp of Indian culture. This was inevitable, for it is in conformity with the general law of cultural diffusion throughout the ages.

[1] Vide p. 262-3: *Monumental Java* by J. F. Scheltema

Even at a time when India was in a position to teach she was not unwilling to learn from others. Sir Charles Eliot mentions an amusing incident as to how Bindusara, the father of Asoka, exchanged missions with Antiochus and expressed a wish to buy a professor, but Antiochus is said to have replied that Greek professors were not for sale!

The cultural contact between India and Persia was continuous and if Indian ideas passed to the West, it could have been only through Persia. It was Persia's destiny that if she became the heir to all the Babylonian and Chaldean lore, she could not keep it to herself but had to transmit it to all the provinces of her vast empire. If Alexander's conquest of Persia introduced Greek culture into Persia, Greece in her turn did not fail to learn from her conquered rival. Prof. Shustery has recorded: 'It is a well known fact the great Greek philosophers lived, when either Iran was in direct touch with them, as in the reign of the Achaemenians or when she was under their rule as in the reign of Alexander and his successors. It was impossible that the Iranians as such could have remained ignorant of Greek wisdom. Particularly so, when we find living examples such as Artabaz, Aryavarta, Huravdha, Mithridates of Pont and so many others who were well acquainted with Greek literature. King Khushro I of the Sassanian dynasty was a patron of philosophy. He had given protection to the Greek philosophers, who had left Roman territory and had taken refuge in Iran. There was a university at Gunde Shahpur where medicine and philosophy were taught. A number of works by Aristotle and Porphyry had already been translated into Pahalvi and Syrian languages, and all this is a proof that Greek philosophy was known in Iran before the Islamic Khilafat. We also know from Greek sources that Alexander ordered a number of Iranian works to be translated into Greek and the Greek philosophers and physicians and statesmen were present at the court of the Achaemenians. Therefore we may be convinced of the fact that the Greeks and the Iranians both influenced one another in science, philosophy and literature. We may as well say that the Unani system of medicine has been wholly copied from Greece, because the meaning of the word *Unani* is Greek and the system is supposed to have been received from Galen and other Greek physicians.

But ninety per cent of the Unani system is either Iranian or Indian and hardly ten per cent Greek, and such also is the fact in connection with the so-called Grecian-Islamic philosophy'.

More than a thousand years after Alexander, Europe and western Asia came once again into violent collision over the question of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem and after all the bitterness of the conflict the east once again emerged triumphant in the realm of culture. This cultural conquest cannot be fully appreciated till we realise the part that the downfall of the Persian Empire meant to the conquering Arabs. The Arabs were literally uncultured. They were hardly able to distinguish between gold and silver or camphor and flour. The vigour generated by the keen desert air and the enthusiasm born of a new religion enabled them to carry everything before them. But they had the good sense to appreciate the cultural superiority of their conquered foe and did not disdain to adopt it wholesale. In this process the peculiar adaptability of Persian character was a great help, for millions of them became Mahomedans, took to Arabic and helped to build up the Saracenic civilisation. Some of the most noted names in Arabic literature were really Persian. Abu Haniffa the great jurist of the Sunni fold was a Persian. Avicenna (Ibn-Sina) the great philosopher who revived the study of Greek philosophy in Europe was a Persian. The whole system of administration was Persian. The unity of human nature in the Arab and the Persian was thus asserted and this unity was asserted on a far wider scale as the result of the Crusades.

As Hegel asserts, the Christian Crusaders had the satisfaction of capturing the empty tomb of Jesus, but what was infinitely more precious they once again caught the breath of a living culture. The Perso-Arab had treasured those exquisite beauties of Greek philosophy and literature, which a sullen and narrow-minded Christian priesthood had condemned to oblivion as being only pagan. The Arabic translations of these classics and the work of Avicenna and Averroes constituted the basis on which the whole structure of Scholastic philosophy came to be reared and Europe once again became conscious of her cultural past. Verily is human spirit greater than the narrow bounds of a continent or a race.

Persia, defeated and humiliated, made herself felt in the sphere of culture to the utmost confines of Christendom, and made herself politically felt by creating the great schism which has divided the Mahomedan world into Shiahs and Sunnis. But politically she made herself more constructively useful in the extension of Mahomedan culture in the lands east of Persia, particularly India in the days of the great Moghuls. Akbar represents the flower of the Mahomedan world, as Asoka did that of the Buddhist world. It is the glory of India to have given birth to two monarchs, who belong to the ages.

I trust I have succeeded in showing that in spite of wars and mutual jealousies humanity as a whole constitutes one family with the same desires, the same impulses and the same ideas. That is why in the course of ages men have been willing to learn from one another even after devastating wars and to take one step forward. Human history is one long tale of creative activity and wholesale borrowings from one another, and civilisation a huge co-operative adventure. At every stage of human progress there may have been a heavy travail, a heavy toll of men, a heavy loss of artistic and literary treasures. But looking back on the whole panorama of human existence with our prejudices and passions lulled to rest and giving place to a dispassionate desire to cull a few thoughts from the past, we cannot but feel that life has not been entirely worthless, that somehow humanity has jogged on, or if you so please, blundered along a path which has brought the different human races more and more together.

(*To be continued.*)

THE AESTHETES AND WALTER PATER

By K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar, m.a.

To the vast majority of students of English Literature, Walter Pater is little more than a name. The insignificant minority that professes to know its Pater well enough is hope lessly divided in its attempt to assess his importance as an author, as an aesthete and as a philosopher. There are those who believe that Pater's central achievement lies in his *Conclusion to The Renaissance.* It is an affair of some six pages but it none the less formulates a philosophy of life with such unique finality that, for the moment at any rate, you are absolutely convinced. This theory of life that Pater offered to his audience was distinctly Pagan; it was more, it was Epicurean. It is therefore natural that scholars who think of Pater as the author of the *Conclusion* only should write him down as an apostle of self-indulgence, an undesirable sort of person. There are others who work out that Pater's achievement, ultimately, is zero, inasmuch as the Hebraicizing of *Marius the Epicurean* completely neutralised the positive Paganizing of the *Conclusion* and the quiet Hellenizing of the *Greek studies.* To some others, again, Pater is but an item in the Aesthetic Movement that was all in a rage during the last few decades of the nineteenth century. Like the Aesthetes of the time, Oscar Wilde and Swinburne among the rest, Walter Pater was a victim of anything "intense", was one who would, in whatever he wrote, "quite too utterly utter." A fourth set of people are content to admire the exquisite verbal wizardry of isolated passages, and to picture him primarily, even solely, as a literary artist. It must be admitted that there is a commendable simplicity in these generalisations. Unfortunately, anyone who has read all Pater with an open mind cannot fail to notice how glaringly inadequate the generalisations are to meet the facts of the case. The problem is a far more complex one and a solution must be based not merely on an intimate knowledge of the entire volume of Pater's work but also on a historical and a comparative study

of the literary movements and literary personalities of the period.

The terms "Pre-Raphaelitism" and "Aestheticism" and the catching phrase "Art for Art's Sake" had an extraordinary currency during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Their interdependence has been generally recognized: but the precise nature of it has never been satisfactorily explained. Now, the intriguing prefix "Pre-Raphaelite" which Rossetti, Millais, Holman Hunt and four others chose for their "Brotherhood" in the autumn of 1848 was not their own concoction. Nearly forty years earlier the term had been used by certain German painters in Rome to distinguish their religious order which sought to purge Art of the irreligious elements it had assimilated from the time of Raphael onwards down to their own day. While these German painters revolted against the material aspect of the Raphael tradition, Rossetti and his friends broke away rather from the cramping limitations and the unreal conventions that had accumulated about and stifled the soul of the pure Raphaelite Art during the three or four centuries after the Renaissance. The German painters thought of the religious exuberance of the Middle Ages; "the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood" of 1848 ignored this and only thought of the play of individual freedom in and the supreme naturalness of mediaeval works of art. Some of the members of the "Brotherhood" exhibited paintings in consonance with the principles of Art they had set forth in their paper *The Germ*. The curiously conservative public was definitely alarmed at this innovation and the watch-dogs of British public opinion howled and screamed in the popular press. At last John Ruskin, urged by Coventry Patmore, came forward as the champion of the "Brotherhood", convinced as he was that they were merely following up his own advice to artists offered so early as 1843 in *Modern Painters*. The two letters he wrote to the *Times* in May 1851 brought about the desired change and the campaign of calumniation was at an end.

It is obvious that the term "Pre-Raphaelite", whatever relevance it may have when applied to painting, can never be appropriate in any discussion on Poetry. But when Rossetti, a professed "Pre-Raphaelite", published such weird and wonderful poems as *The Blessed Damozel, The King's*

Tragedy and *Sister Helen,* a confusion of thought inevitably arose in the minds of many persons. Confusion was worse confounded when William Morris's *Defence of Guenevere* and Swinburne's *Poems and Ballads* were published, the former in 1858 and the other eight years later: and the poems were all so alike in their mediaevalism, in their rich sensuousness, in their emphasis upon colour and form; and, above all, Rossetti, Morris and Swinburne were friends,——that everybody knew, of course! It may be that Rossetti drew his inspiration from the older Italian poets, that Morris imitated the French poets of the later Middle Ages, and that Swinburne's masters were of all countries and of all times: and yet, even the most superficial reader could say that there was a vital characteristic which held their poems together as a distinct and separate class. Was it their "Pre-Raphaelitism?" The question went round in hushed whispers. And then the thing happened. A Mr. Robert Buchanan under the pseudonym "Thomas Maitland" contributed a scurrilous article to *The Contemporary Review* entitled "The Fleshy School of Poetry: D. G. Rossetti." It was an extremely clever piece of writing, but its wilful misrepresentations and its unreservedly malignant insinuations made it fundamentally rotten criticism. Rossetti's reply, "The Stealthy School of Criticism," appeared in the *Athenaeum;* it was admirable, full of restraint, and effective, but it fell on deaf ears and no one cared to be convinced. Victorian respectability was content to be in the wrong with Mr. Maitland rather than be in the right with D. G. Rossetti.

About this time a certain "pale creature, with a large moustache," was "looking out of the window at the sunset;" he had already published a study of Coleridge's writings and had stated, in passing, that our culture "is not supreme, our intellectual life is incomplete, we fail of the intellectual throne, if we have no inward longing, inward chastening, inward joy." He had studied the early Italian painters with more than ordinary zest and had familiarized himself with the literature of the later Middle Ages; and now "looking out of the window" he recognized Rossetti as well as Morris, was quite in sympathy with them, was better able to understand them and to define the one remarkable quality of their poems

than anybody else; and, accordingly, this creature, a practically unknown Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, by name Walter Horatio Pater,—yes, this creature proceeded to extirpate the word "Pre-Raphaelitism" as applied to the poetry of Rossetti, Morris and Swinburne and to supply in its stead the apter and less odious word "Aestheticism." The *Conclusion* was written: studies of typical Renaissance figures appeared in the *Fortnightly Review;* and in 1873 these were published in book form with a significant *Preface.* The few who read these essays were tantalised: here was something definitely new, something decidedly subversive, almost immoral! "The aim of the true student of aesthetics," Pater had written, is "to define beauty, not in the most abstract, but in the most concrete terms possible, to find, not a universal formula for it, but the formula which expresses most adequately this or that special manifestation of it." That was not quite the orthodox view, but it was allowed to stand. The impossible man, however, went on to say that "we have an interval, and then our place knows us no more. Some spend this interval in listlessness, some in high passions, the wisest in art and song........... Of this wisdom, the poetic passion, the desire of beauty, the love of art for art's sake, has most; for art comes to you professing frankly to give nothing but the highest quality to your moments as they pass, and simply for those moments' sake." Thus, in the eyes of the general public, Pater had frankly indicted himself.

The doctrine of "Art for Art's sake", which developed as a by-product of the Aesthetic movement, has been variously interpreted by different critics. Some have taken it to mean nothing more than a warning to all artists against prematurely running away from their jobs and they have maintained how irrelevant it is when referred to the reader or to the critic. Others, like Oscar Wilde, went much further than Pater himself was inclined to go, and equated Art with a super-divinity. Art was more vital than life; it was "neither moral, nor immoral, it was non-moral." Art was not to imitate life or to learn from it; it was rather to be the other way about,—life deliberately imitating Art and being conditioned by it. Sensuous aestheticism of the theory was no doubt a perversion of Pater's intellectual epicureanism as broadly outlined in

the *Conclusion*: and it was responsible for Wilde's later annihilation. It is unfortunate that Pater should be criticised for the sins of some of his professed followers: but the multitude cannot discriminate. As it was, Mr. Mallock's satiric portraiture of Pater in *The New Republic* must be pronounced to be comparatively mild criticism. Mr. Mallock caricatured others besides Pater: Mr. Luke who stands for Arnold is excellent fun, while Pater in the garb of Mr. Rose is represented with no justification whatsoever as congenitally weak and ineffectual. The public fastened upon this picture of Walter Pater with extraordinary avidity and it was shocked: he is Mr. Rose, the Pre-Raphaelite, is he? and he always speaks in an undertone, and his two topics are self-indulgence and art—indeed! No, this Mr. Rose was quite a dangerous man altogether: it were best to let him severely alone,—with his self-indulgence and art.

After all Mr. Mallock had spoken only the truth: at the worst he had been guilty of having misplaced the emphasis, but in rudiments he had been correct. Self-indulgence and art, these were master passions with Pater most certainly. Self-indulgence, with Pater, was not what it was, what it has been, with others. To him it meant simply the acceptance of "the splendour of our experience and of its awful brevity" and consequently the gathering of "all we are into one desperate effort to see and touch" and the ignoring of all "theories about the things we see and touch." This is elaborated further as follows: "the theory or idea or system which requires of us the sacrifice of any part of this experience, in consideration of some interest into which we cannot enter, or some abstract theory we have not identified with ourselves, or what is only conventional, has no real claim upon us." This is not a whit less subversive than the philosophy of the "Life-worshipper" formulated by Mr. Aldous Huxley; nor more subversive, as Mr. T. S. Eliot has pointed out, than Arnold's repeated insistence on Culture and Conduct. Here is a description of Mr. Huxley's "Life-worshipper"—"His fundamental assumption is that life on this planet is valuable in itself without any reference to hypothetical higher worlds, eternities, future existences...... The next assumption is that the end of life...... is more life, that the purpose of living is

to live....... The 'Life-worshipper's' aim is to achieve a vital equilibrium, not by drawing in his diversities, not by moderating his exuberances (for Exuberance, in the words of Blake, is Beauty) but by giving them rein one against the other. His is the equilibrium of balanced senses, the safest perhaps of all." The polished clarity of the sentences does not mince matters. But the substance was there, in however nebulous a condition, when Matthew Arnold wrote: "culture......shows us how worthy and divine a thing is the religious side in man, though it is not the whole of man......... culture yet makes us eschew an inadequate conception of man's totality." Be it remembered that Arnold never explained what exactly his culture was: to the last he shirked a definition. When he said that culture was "a study in perfection" or that it was a counterblast to the Philistinism of the day, he said very little. Only in a vague sort of way we could picture it before our minds. It is possible that Arnold's culture was made up, oddly enough, of Art or Literature on the one part and Religion on the other. The literature of high seriousness—the cultivation of it and an hourly appreciation of it—was a part of his creed: but, somewhat curiously, he mixed up in it the emotions of Christianity while summarily rejecting the faith itself. When he said that "the power of Christianity has been in the immense emotion which it has excited", he, in fact, anticipated Mr. Middleton Murray's statement that he reveres Christ, not because he was Son of God, not because he was the Saviour, but simply because he was one of the greatest mystics that had ever lived. It would therefore be seen that for the expulsion of faith and thought from religion and for the relegation of philosophy and religion to a lower sphere of man's consciousness than Art or Culture or Conduct or Aestheticism, that for these modern disintegrating tendencies, in short, Arnold was the intellectual who set the ball rolling, even if not quite deliberately. Pater was slightly more outspoken: that was all.

Mr. Rose's two topics are, said Mr. Mallock, self-indulgence and art: the first has been disposed of; now what is this business of Art? The best answer, perhaps, is contained in a recently published book *The Strange Necessity* by Miss Rebecca West. She recapitulates the impressions made on

her by James Joyce's *Ulysses* and by Ingres's painting of "a bright-eyed young man with dark hair curling damp on his forehead and a snuff-coloured coat." Miss West asks herself: "what is the necessity that is served in me by the contemplation alike of a young man with damp dark curls . . . . and of a Dublin slut? . . . . Why does art matter? And why does it matter so much?" The true art critic, says Pater, would ask the questions—"What is this song or picture, this engaging personality presented in life or in a book to *me*? What effect does it really produce on me? Does it give me pleasure? and if so, what sort or degree of pleasure? How is my nature modified by its presence, and under its influence?" The two sets of questions are similar in cast. The answers to them, in either instance, constitute that philosophy of life which would look up to art as a solace which alleviates the agony of the thought that a counted number of pulses only is given us. To Miss West the problem of art is "to communicate to the beholder an emotion caused in the artist by a certain subject." The artists, she thinks, "record what happens after a thing has happened, what life amounts to after it has been lived . . . . all the arts are on a perfect equality regarding this necessity to collect information of one sort or another about the Universe." She would follow the advice of Dr. Santayana and make any true work of art "the starting point for a chain of inferences that should reveal the whole Universe." Ultimately she is convinced that art is nothing less than "a way of making joys perpetual." To Pater art is all this but nowhere would he express himself explicitly: his refined sensibility would not permit him to carve his thoughts with the razor blade of mere intelligence.

The difficulty with Pater is that no single formula would accurately describe him: it has been done, again and again, but the terms Hedonist, Aesthete, Epicurean, apply only to a part of him, and perhaps not even to the essential part of the man. Though repeatedly called a Pre-Raphaelite, Pater did not subscribe to all the views of the "Brotherhood"; though commonly identified with the Aesthetic movement, he did not swallow all that Swinburne or Watts-Dunton said; and though he held that "the end of life is not action but

contemplation—*being* as distinct from *doing*—a certain disposition of the mind, is, in some shape or other, the principle of all the higher morality," yet he did not go the slippery way later traced by Oscar Wilde and the other apologists of "Art for Art's Sake" theory. There are indications which even suggest that Pater was at heart one who believed in the spirit and felt mysterious stirrings in the profundities of his being. Here is a passage from the *Conclusion*: "while all melts under our feet, we may well catch at any exquisite passion, or any contribution to knowledge that seems by a lifted horizon to set the spirit free for a moment, or any stirring of the senses, strange dyes, strange colours, and curious odours, or work of the artist's hands, or the face of one's friend." That was his idea: "to set the spirit free for a moment." That Pater was intimately touched by the philosophy of the spirit is seen otherwise as well. In one of his earliest essays, that on Coleridge, he writes: "what the moralist asks is, Shall we gain or lose by surrendering human life to the relative spirit? . . . . The relative spirit, by dwelling constantly on the more fugitive conditions or circumstances of things, breaking through a thousand rough and brutal classifications, and giving elasticity to inflexible principles, begets an intellectual finesse, of which the ethical result is a delicate and tender justness in the criticism of human life." Almost all his best works, *The Child in the House, Marius the Epicurean, Imaginary Portraits* are attempts at spiritual portraiture: though, as J. B. (is it John Buchan?) points out, his "characters wear but a thin garment of flesh", it is easy enough to follow all their divers mental processes and visualize a sort of spiritual graph for Florian, for Marius, for Denys L'Auxerrois and for each of the rest. Pater, it is claimed, put a good deal of himself into his portraits: it is quite possible and M. Anatole France's dictum—"Failing the resolution to keep quiet we can only talk about ourselves" lends support to any story of self-portraiture. About Pater it can be said, what cannot surely be said about many of his contemporaries, that he wrote only when absolutely impelled to by an inward urge. The result was he could not detach himself from the subject of his sketch. Of his essay on Wordsworth, says Dr. E. E. Hale, and I should think quite

justifiably, that it is "a more accurate expression of Pater's own ideas than of Wordsworth's." Or take Pater's celebrated passage on "La Giaconda" in his essay on Leonardo da Vinci: "The presence that rose thus so strangely beside the waters, is expressive of what in the ways of a thousand years men had come to desire......... All the thoughts and experience of the world have etched and moulded there, in that which they have of power to refine and make expressive the outward form, the animalism of Greece, the lust of Rome, the mysticism of the middle age with its spiritual ambition and imaginative loves, the return of the Pagan world, the sins of the Borgias. She is older than the rocks among which she sits........ and, as Leda, was the mother of Helen of Troy, and, as Saint Anne, the mother of Mary;........" Fascinated and thrilled to the roots of your being, you ask: is not Pater putting his own inspired imaginings into the Mona Lisa? The passage is admirable, and probably there is not another such thing in English literature, but as Oscar Wilde and Paul Bourget remarked, Pater taps from Mona Lisa ideas and images which not Leonardo himself had thought of. The spirit behind the matter was not seldom the spur of Pater's enthusiasms: his criticisms of Sandro Botticelli's Madonnas and of the famous *Birth of Venus* reveal the same tendency.

As pointed out at the outset it is customary with some critics to assume that Pater's later works, especially *Marius the Epicurean* (1885) and *Plato and Platonism* (1893) are of no consequence whatsoever. On the contrary, they are as indispensable to a just appreciation of Pater's ideas and art as the *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*. In the *Conclusion*, even in the essay on Wordsworth, Pater expresses his ideas with confidence. "Not the fruit of experience, but experience itself, is the end," he said in the former: in the latter he stressed "the supreme importance of contemplation in the conduct of life." In *Marius the Epicurean* the brilliant cock-sureness and conviction of youth perceptibly loses ground. The book itself, says Mr. Eliot, "is incoherent; its method is a number of fresh starts; its content is a hodge-podge of the learning of the classical don, the impressions of the sensitive holiday visitor to Italy, and a prolonged flirtation

with the liturgy." But even Mr. Eliot accepts that it is Pater's "most arduous attempt at a work of literature." Marius's first start is negative: the death of his friend Flavian had made him realise the idea of inevitable mortality. He would, "with the Cyrenaics of all ages", live in the present and fill it up "with vivid sensations and such intelligent apprehensions as, in strength and directness and their immediately realized values at the bar of actual experience, are most like sensations." His sensations need not shock the moral world outside him: not even simple pleasure would he yearn for,—rather for completeness and fulness of life. The Young Marius, thus equipped with a philosophy not unlike that of the *Conclusion*, goes to Rome that he may be able "to understand the various forms of ancient art and thought. . . . . .—to 'pluck out the heart of their mystery' and in turn become the interpreter of them to others." But, once in Rome, Marius's thoughts turn elsewhere: he is bewildered by the religious and secular controversies of the day: he feels himself incessantly pulled hither and thither, towards the militant stoicism of Marcus Aurelius now, and anon towards the subtle lights of Christianity; he is now with Fronto discussing stoicism, and the next moment with Cornelius, invidiously gravitating towards the religion of the Galilean. In the end Marius capitulates to Cornelius; there had been no intellectual or philosophical doubts which needed to be set at rest—in his mind Marius had been quite all right: but the heart, the too human heart, had been feeling lonely, sick and miserable, and the companionship of Cornelius and the external stimulus of the liturgical and ceremonial aspects of Christianity give him the desired peace of mind and he dies a Christian only in so far as he got "all the emotional kick out of Christianity" that he could, without, however, "the bother of believing it." That is to say, in *Marius*, Pater has not really retracted, in fundamentals, what he had said in the *Conclusion*.

Pater's last considerable work (in his own opinion, the greatest), *Plato and Platonism*, was published a year before his death. Few critics have given it the attention it so richly deserves. Of this book, too, says Dr. Hale that "it will have more interest for the student of Pater than for the student of Plato." Pater's sympathy with the Platonic philosophy is

apparent from his earlier studies on Coleridge, Giordano Bruno, and Pico della Mirandola. The philosophy of the *Conclusion* was based on the famous saying of Heracleitus: "All things vanish, nothing is permanent." Just as Heracleitus had been misunderstood in his time, Pater's *Conclusion* had been misinterpreted and caricatured. In *Plato and Platonism* Pater offers a new variation of the original theory. Some fresh ingredients are added to it, certain objectionable elements taken away: there is no positive statement, it is all in the form of question and counter-question, suggestions, objections, stray thoughts held in suspension or isolated in vacuo. In spite of all this, however, a few ideas do emerge in the end, nebulous and tenuous by themselves, yet as an amalgam offering a sufficiently rational view of life and conduct. Firstly, there is this idea of a war between the centrifugal and centripetal tendencies in man—a conflict that is as old as Time and that has tortured thousands from Brutus to Nora of *A Doll's House.* The Platonists turned their eyes inward and here discovered their kingdom: the external world is nothing, and says Pater, "all true knowledge will be like the knowledge of a person, of living persons" and truth itself was for Plato "something to *look* at", as embodied in the conduct of a person. The distinction is not between Hedonism and Eudaemonism, much less between egoism and altruism, and certainly not been greedy selfishness and high disinterested devotion to humanity as a whole. The dilemma is simply this: must one realise his "mission" best by contemplation, quiet diversions in the realms of Art, and by attainment in due time of an inward sobriety and calm, or must one rather headlong join the fray, and live its crowded, rickety existence, and thus fulfil his destiny? The choice is largely a matter of individual temper. Some would, perhaps, try a judicious mixture of the two. As for Pater himself, the "scholarly recluse", the way is clear: he would be happy best apart.

Secondly, there is more than due insistence placed on "harmony," "music," "discipline," "Ascesis," that the words seem to have more than a meaning,—they seem almost to connote that state of being which the method of contemplation or of the cultivation of Art or of turning our thoughts inward,

must, sooner or later, enable us to realise. Was this, then, Pater's final standpoint? "Not to be 'pure' from the body but to identify it, in its utmost fairness, with the fair soul, by a gymnastic 'fused in music' "—was this not merely Plato's but Pater's, perhaps was it only Pater's own primary objective, towards which his experiences, his whole existence, had tended? If that were so, indeed, why, where is the subversive influence in Pater's philosophy? To advise us to eschew what is morbid, what is superfluous, to indicate to us the quiet graces of contemplation, to protest against all surplusage in literary expression, to incant an exhortation that our existence must aspire to a condition of music, and ultimately attain a natural harmony—where is the immorality in all this? On the other hand, Pater emerges as one of the great moralists of his time. As early as 1874 he had spoken about finding "the true moral significance of art and poetry." And, with time, the feeling had deepened presumably. Whether or not, as Dr. Saintsbury remarked, he was the greatest critic of his generation, this, at any rate, appears to be certain—that Walter Pater was, as Milton and Johnson had been before him in earlier eras, the one indisputably moral king of his time and in his works as such would he be long remembered.

A NOTE ON THE FOOD AND FEEDING HABITS OF *SARDINELLA GIBBOSA*

BY

DR. D. W. DEVANESEN, M.A., D.I.C., Ph. D. (*Lond*).
Assistant Biologist, Department of Fisheries, Madras.

INTRODUCTION.

Sardinella gibbosa is a clupeid fish closely allied to the 'oil-sardine' of the West Coast of India, *Sardinella longiceps*. It is also a shoaling fish and is the object of one of the most economically important fisheries in the Palk Bay, Southern India. Its food consists of planktonic organisms. The preponderance or otherwise of this fish in certain regions will, therefore, to a large extent depend on the relative abundance of the particular plankton on which it feeds. Consequently, a knowledge of its feeding habits will also help in understanding the course of its shoaling movements.

This study is based on the stomach contents of over 245 specimens ranging from 1¾ inches to 6 inches captured in the shallow sea[1] between Pamban Bridge and Krusadai from 25th April 1931 to 8th June 1931. The name of this fish, according to Day, is *Clupea fimbriata*: but I have adopted the most recent name given by Tate Regan *(5)*

SHOALING MOVEMENTS

On the evening of 21 April 1931, at about 4 p.m., a moving disturbance of the surface of the sea in the Kundugal channel similiar to what is caused by pelting rain on water was noticed. Sea birds were seen hovering over the area, dipping their beaks in the water and carrying away occasionally a fish. This left no doubt that it was a shoal of fish moving close to the surface. The shoaling continued with interruptions for several days. Attempts made to sample out the shoals met

[1] The section of the sea is indicated in Admiralty Chart No. 68-A., Ceylon, Palk Strait and Gulf of Mannar—Northern sheet and in Plate I, Maps of Krusadai Island District, Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, Natural History Section, Vol. I, No. 1, 1927.

with success only on the 25th April when two fishermen were engaged for the purpose. The fish caught were *Sardinella gibbosa*. On several subsequent occasions, the sampling of the shoals showed entire catches of *Sardinella gibbosa* with two exceptions when a stray specimen of *Hilsa kanagurta* also was found. When scared by the falling nets, the signs of shoaling on the surface entirely ceased. It was not clear whether the surface disturbance was invariably an indication of the feeding activity of the fish for the stomach of fish captured from such moving shoals did not always contain food. It is therefore possible that such surface disturbance may also be caused at times by the simple act of locomotion of this gregarious fish by several of its members swimming close to the surface. Nor was the absence of superficial disturbance always an indication that the fish were not there. For, the small shore-seine nets of the Kundugal fishermen plied in the morning hours in water devoid of such disturbance brought good catches of young *Sardinella gibbosa*. The shoaling movements were seen only in calm weather and were not confined to definite periods of the day though they were more in evidence in the early hours of the morning and the late hours of the evening.

Nature of Food

Fish smaller than $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches could not be obtained at the season. The diet, therefore, of the earlier stages of this fish is not dealt with here. There was but little difference in the character of the food of the various sizes of fish examined. The bulk of the diet was crustaceous in nature, being zoaea larvæ of Malacostraca including crabzoaea, copepods and Leucifer. Of phytoplankton, only *Trichodesmium* formed the chief source of food. When it was abundant in the plankton, such was the predilection this fish had for it that their stomachs were found enormously distended with it. Shelled larvæ of bivalves ranked third in importance in the dietary. The earlier stages of the Veliger were never met with. *Coscinodiscus* was occasionally found but it is more likely that it had been indirectly introduced into the stomach through the zoaea stages and copepods which are known to feed on phytoplankton.

The Arrow worm (Sagitta) was met with only in two fish, 2 inches in length; a single specimen was found in each; but it is likely that, if large-sized fish are examined over a longer period, this worm will be found to be a regular article of diet.

Members of Foraminifera of both perforate and imperforate types were found in the stomachs in specimens of fish ranging in size from 2 inches to 5 inches on five occasions. Below is a table showing fish ascertained to feed on foraminifera and which had empty stomachs.

Date.	Locality.	No. of fish. examined.	Size.	Remarks relating to stomach contents, etc.
24-5-31	Kundugal Point	12	2″—4″	Ten had empty stomachs; the rest had trichodesmium and copepods.
25-5-31	Do.	12	3″—4″	Two had foraminiferan sand; ten had empty stomachs.
26-5-31	Do.	12	2″—3½″	All had empty stomachs.
31-5-31	Do.	12	3″—4″	Two had foraminiferan sand; seven had empty stomachs.
1-6-31	Do.	12	2½″—4″	Two had foraminiferan sand; nine had empty stomachs.
3-6-31	Do.	12	3″—4″	Two had foraminiferan sand; seven had empty stomachs.
8-6-31	Do.	22	2½″—5″	Four had foraminiferan sand; eighteen had empty stomachs.

COMPARISON WITH SARDINELLA LONGICEPS AND CLUPEA HARENGUS

Of the food of the larval and post-larval stages, we have no knowledge. It will be seen that the adult fish is partial to animal food, crustaceous in character. The food favoured by *Sardinella longiceps (3)* consists chiefly of the following phytoplanktonic organisms and to a lesser degree of copepods and shelled larvæ of bivalves:

(1) Diatoms e.g. *Biddulphia, Coscinodiscus, Rhizosolenia, Fragillaria* and *Nitzschia.*

(2) Dinoflagellates e.g. *Peridinium, Dinophysis, Prorocentrum, Ornithocercus* and *Peridiniopsis.*

It must be admitted, however, that during the season which covers this investigation, the phytoplankton of the area, excepting *Trichodesmium,* was largely in abeyance and the

surface plankton was decidedly dominated by microcrustacea. The investigation has not been spread over a year to draw definite and permanent conclusions regarding the tastes of *Sardinella gibbosa.* It is quite possible that this fish may have a wider range in the selection of its food than has been ascertained in this brief study. It will be seen that *Leucifer,* Zoaea stages and *Trichodesmium* do not enter into the dietary of *Sardinella longiceps.*

A comparison with the food of the European herring, *Clupea harengus* will not be out of place here. We have complete accounts of its food *(2)* and *(4)* from the time it is born. The full-grown herring is more catholic in its tastes; young sand-eels (Ammodytes), Oikopleura, Arrow-worms (Sagitta), Copepods, Amphipods, Schizopods and fish eggs are taken, to mention only the chief items. Plant food is taken but seldom by the adult herring. Though fish-eggs and Appendicularia were common in the surface plankton collected in the area during the period of investigation, the stomach contents of the fish examined did not have them. *Sardinella gibbosa* agrees more with *Clupea harengus* in its partiality for animal food than with *Sardinella longiceps* which has a definite bias for plant-food.

Discussion

The question whether the planktonic organisms which served as food were captured by the fish or whether the fish passively allowed the water containing the plankton to pass through the gills straining the plankton by means of its gill-rakers and using it as food presented itself several times during the course of the investigation. When fairly large organisms like *Leucifer* and *Sagitta* are concerned, it is not difficult to imagine that their inclusion in the food must have resulted by definite acts of capture involving quick efforts on the part of the fish. How else could the presence in the food of the large crab-zoaea of the genus *Porcellana* with its very long rostral and postero-lateral spines be explained! This remarkable crab larva had been taken by four fish. In the case of *Leucifer,* its phosphorescence as much as its size will aid in effecting its capture at nights. But that minute zoaea stages, copepods and the diatom *Trichodesmium* could have been captured by the fish snapping at them, is hard to believe.

In these cases it is likely that there is a process of straining by the gill-rakers. The fish probably seek the regions where such organisms abound and there, owing to the great preponderance of the organisms, it might be possible to obtain the food by mere straining. The fish are not likely to feed in this passive manner where the plankton are unpalatable to them.

The following organisms were found in the plankton collected on the morning of 26—4—1931.

(1) Developing fish eggs and fish larvæ.
(2) Echinopluteus larvæ.
(3) Appendicularia.
(4) *Trichodesmium*.
(5) Copepods.
(6) Shelled larvæ of bivalves.
(7) *Sagitta*.

The stomach contents of *Sardinella gibbosa* captured in the same area where and at the same time when the plankton was collected did not show all the constituents of that plankton. There were in the stomachs only filamentous lumps of *Trichodesmium* and numerous shelled larvæ of bivalves. Such instances perhaps indicate that the fish exercise a certain power of selection and do not swallow indiscriminately any planktonic organisms which may come in their way. The habit of selecting planktonic organisms will lead to migrations. For instance, where a favourite item of food like *Trichodesmium* is concerned, it is easy to conceive how shoals of this fish will follow the course of this diatom as the mass of the diatom drifts with wind and current.

On 2—5—31, at 9 a.m., plankton was collected and specimens of *Sardinella gibbosa* were captured as well from a shoal in the same area. Zoaea larvæ, copepods and *Leucifer* were plenty in the sea. But, strange to say, the stomachs of a dozen specimens examined were empty. The fish probably have intervals when they do not feed. On several other occasions too, fish with empty stomachs have been met with from lots collected in different areas but the nature of the plankton had not been ascertained. Still there is little room for doubt that these fish give rest to their stomachs and that their cessation of feeding is not due to lack of plankton food.

The occurrence of Foramainifera in the food of *Sardinella gibbosa* has been already mentioned. Such examples were met with only in lots captured by fishermen with a shore seine net in the shallows near Kundugal Point, a spot in the shore of Pamban Island opposite Krusadai. (Vide Admiralty Chart 69, Pamban Pass.) There was no disturbance at the surface of the sea when the fishermen plied their nets. The fact that these protozoans were invariably mixed with small particles of sand led one to infer that the fish could not have captured the foraminifera from surface plankton.

This inference coupled with the observation that Foraminifera were not present in the stomach contents of fish captured elsewhere in the section of the sea made me to suspect that the fish might have been feeding on a littoral deposit of Foraminifera. The Kundugal Point was, therefore, inspected and the fine sand which characterised this spot was microscopically examined. It was an agreeable surprise to find that the sand contained a large number of Foraminiferan shells. From the table on page 4, it will be seen that there was a large percentage of individuals with empty stomachs which is not easy to explain. It is among them that a few are taken which have Foraminiferan sand in their stomachs. Do the fish eat this, only when hard pressed for food or if they are attracted to the shallows near Kundugal Point by the presence of foraminiferan sand, why is it that the stomachs of the great majority, if not of all, do not contain Foraminifera? These questions remain to be answered.

(1) Day, F. ... "The Fauna of British India, Fishes" Vol. I. 1889.

(2) Hardy, A. C. ... "The Herring in Relation to its Animate Environment; Part I The Food and Feeding Habits of the Herring with special reference to the East Coast of England". Fisheries Investigations Series II, Vol. VII, No. 3. 1924.

(3) Hornell, J. and Ramaswami, M. ... "A Contribution to the Life History of the Indian Sardine" Bulletin No. XVII of the Madras Fisheries Department. 1923.

(4) Lebour, Marie V. ... "The Food of Young Clupeoids". Journal of the Marine Biological Association, Vol. XII. 1921.

(5) *Tate Regan, C.* ... "*A Revision of the Clupeid Fishes of the genera Sardinella Harengula* etc." Annals and Magzine of Natural History, Vol. XIX, 1917.

DUTCH BEGINNINGS IN INDIA PROPER (1580–1615)

BY

T. I. POONEN, M.A.

(*Continued from p. 85 of Vol. IV—No. 1*).

CHAPTER V. (COROMANDEL III)

(1) *THE FACTORIES OF GOLCONDA DURING THE PERIOD THAT FOLLOWED THE DEPARTURE OF THE* ARENT *AND THE* VALCK.

[NOTE.—Unpleasantness with the natives continued. Pieter Ysaacx and Van Wesick even thought of going over to Tirupapuliyur because of the troubles in the north. These troubles were not worse than in previous years. The impression created in the mind of the chronicler is that of something uniform from which nothing sharp comes out.]

APPEAL FROM KANDY.

Nine days after the departure of the *Arent* and the *Valck* there already appeared at Petapoeli an envoy from the king of Kandy to seek help against the Portuguese. On the way, he had been robbed by the Portuguese so that he had to live at the company's cost. Van Wesick sent him the next day to Masulipatam. He thought it best to give hope to the king of Kandy that help would reach with the next coming ships and other compliments. On the 26th November Pieter Ysaacx sent a letter for the king of Ceylon to Van Wesick so that he might see it first and then, as the envoy came to Petapoeli, give him this for the king. He however remained at Masulipatam for long, and appears to have departed again to the south on the 1st of December. He did not seem to have brought for his master much more than compliments. A small number of Dutchmen on Coromandel could do very little against the Portuguese who already had so much power in Ceylon. It was not owing to their failure to recognise the importance of the cinnamon of Ceylon and the favourable situation of the island, both for refreshments for ships and for expansion of their authority, that the Dutch could not pay more serious attention to the overtures from Ceylon.

SERIOUS DIFFICULTIES IN MASULIPATAM.

The Governor of Masulipatam to whom Lodewijk Ysaacx had to lend such a large sum of money was removed from office, and the Dutch received back only a small portion of his debt. The new

Governor of Masulipatam named Pyleppa hoped to enjoy the same benefits as his predecessor. The factors did not want to lend him so much money as he wished. He therefore began to devise other means for his benefit. The native authorities began to ignore the contract concluded with Van Soldt. On the ground that the money was only for the then ruling Governor, they could, with decency, ask the Dutch for duties which were not in harmony with established articles. This Pyleppa did. With the help of his colleague of Petapoeli, Namaiga, he asked the factors for the duty called *Choppa-dallella*, the stamp duty on linen. This happened in June. The Governor felt that as the factors stood in alliance with the court of Golconda, a command issued from thence would make a better impression on the factory keepers than his own words. So there came in 1609 a Brahmin who was a clerk of the king of Golconda and asked the factors 12,000 pagodas for the stamp duty of Masulipatam. When this also failed to move the Dutch, they perceived that they must try to take one of them to the headquarters to compel him there to agree to the payment of the duty. When the Dutch were roundly called to the court to negotiate in the matter of the payment of stamp duty, it led to no consequences. Speedily another counsel was found which of itself would probably lead to the payment of money.

The Dutch now gave a handle. In Petapoeli the junior merchant Pieter Julis in the absence of Van Wesick entrapped at night a thief who was engaged in breaking into the Dutch factory. Helped by the assistant Pieter Klassen, he flogged the thief and delivered him further into the hands of justice. Three or four days later the thief died in prison. The Governor got the long-looked-for opportunity. The charge was brought that the factors had murdered the thief. In the end of September, news was brought to Petapoeli from Golconda that the Dutch had to answer for the case of the thief. Van Wesick wished to secure testimony exonerating the Dutch from the Moorish inhabitants about the question under dispute. He took leave from the brothers Soheyder and departed finally on the 19th October in the company of Pieter Klassen. From Masulipatam, Antony Schorer, junior merchant of that place, also joined them and Mir Camaldy, a friendly native merchant, had offered his company in this difficult journey. Thus the men now went a second time, but now with a burdened mind to the court of Mohammed Koeli. Here the whole reason why they had been summoned appeared clearly. Van Wesick was taken because of the stamp duty. As far as Petapoeli was concerned, this was an easy matter. There the duty was not in force and the Golconda officials defended the Dutch. At Masulipatam, the government had a stronger case. The

envoys meant to achieve their object by honouring Mirsumela, the Chancellor, with a present of 1½ candy sandalwood and 30 large mirrors. But Mirsumela thought this was too little for such a weighty matter as the sum Pyleppa claimed was 5,000 pagodas. The Dutch thereupon offered 250 pagodas. But Pyleppa overstepped the Dutch, and promised a larger sum. Mirsumela now commanded the Dutch to pay 2,000 pagodas for the stamp duty. When it was answered that they had to await the coming of their ship, Mirsumela refused also to excuse them the stamp duty of Petapoeli, much less would he permit them to depart to the coast. The position was far from being an enviable one. The envoys were treated in an unfriendly manner on the streets by the dwellers of the city. Namaiga recognized there was little chance of his enjoying the stamp duty of Petapoeli. He therefore went on another tack and asked port fees for the time the Dutch had been at Petapoeli. He should thus secure 4,000 pagodas. This duty appears even less than the stamp duty to have been usual at Petapoeli, and men who levied it had not applied it to the Dutch business. As regards Petapoeli, the Dutch speedily gained their point. But it was different with Masulipatam. Long standing negotiations that were delayed by the death of a daughter of the prince led to no result in the decision of the question. The envoys were naturally discontented and furious. The position would have become very difficult if a ship had appeared during Van Wesick's stay at Golconda. Luckily, however, no ship appeared. On the 2nd January 1610, Van Wesick came back to Petapoeli from his laborious journey. The further negotiations had not led to any definite result. The Dutch had received permission to depart on condition that distinct debts of the Governor of Masulipatam and the king should be left a security for this, and that, with the coming of the Dutch ships, an envoy should come and negotiate about the questions in dispute. If there was any one who derived great benefit from this affair, that was Mirsumela, who, according to reports, had realized in a month's time 35,000 pagodas as presents from the different parties for his favour.

At Golconda the envoys heard the complaint that the Dutch, after scattering the trade of the Portuguese who formerly used to send annually 200 ships and champas, were themselves sending no ship of theirs and thus trade was languishing. The staying out of the Dutch ships was thus mentioned as the only cause of this travail, i.e., the absence of living trade.

(2) *SOUTH COROMANDEL.*

While in north Coromandel they experienced the already mentioned disastrous consequences, Pieter Jelis Van Ravensteyn wrote in

October 1609 that the losses of the factory in the south would be considerable.

The next fleet appeared on the coast in the spring of 1610. It consisted of the *Little Sun* (under the command of Arend Maertssen), the *Eendracht* (under the command of Willem Janssen) and the yacht *Little Middle Bourgh*. From Guzerat this fleet was to proceed to Tegnapatam as the factors could not even keep off the Portuguese, and leave nutmegs, mace, cloves, sandalwood, 'Sussick' and other wares but not money in cash except what the north Coromandel factors had resolved to leave here. The Caul received by De Bitter about Tegnapatam should be renewed or a new contract concluded for the exclusion of the Portuguese. Four 'pigs of iron' with some gunpowder which was necessary for the defence of the place must be left behind. The remaining goods must be left at Petapoeli and Masulipatam. Thereafter one of the two ships should load the goods bought on the coast and bring them to Bantam. The other should again take up the negotiations with Arakan and Bengal. As Van Wesick was about to depart, they must try to persuade Pieter Ysaacx to continue in his office for another year as, by the massacre of Banda, very few people were available there and a certain Bonvaert who should have gone to Masulipatam was dead. In conclusion, it was observed that they were still to do as much damage to the enemy in San Thome as before, as no definite news had come of the conclusion of the armistice. As regards the last, news was brought that the twelve years' truce was as good as concluded, and that, with the necessary caution, Indian allies had to be prepared for it. In the truce, it would be decided that also allies with whom treaties should be entered into two years after the sending of the provisional news from Holland i.e., to the latter half of March 1611 should also be recognized. At the same time, men must try, as far as possible, to renew the old alliances. A copy of these instructions was sent by L'Hermite with the three ships mentioned above. In the last half of January 1610 the Dutch ships left Atjeh—Arend Maertssen with the *Little Sun* in the direction of St. Thome, and Willem Janssen with the *Eendracht* and the yacht to the waters of Ceylon. When they arrived on the 10th February, a ship coming from Bengal, *The Noose Signora d'Agura*, was captured. Negotiations were entered into with the king of Kandy. A ship with some elephants was to be sent to Tegnapatam.

Arend Maertssen, as stated above, directed his course to St. Thome so that, if possible, he might do injury to the Portuguese. He kept for some time to the middle of the coast, burned two ships and took as prey two others loaded with rice. After that he came taking with him the two captured ships on the 2nd March to Tirupapuliyur.

Already Pieter Ysaacx and Jan Van Wesick had sent a letter to Tegnapatam to the signors of the ships that should arrive there wherein they declared the pressing necessity for help, which could not be secured without great presents. Further 370 packs Coromandelese linen and 25 bars of indigo lay there ready for shipping. In a subsequent letter, Pieter Ysaacx wrote that there was need especially for porcelain and cloves among the wares which would be brought by the *Great Sun*. Besides the abovementioned, the ship brought mace, sandalwood, damask, tafta and still more wares to Tirupapuliyur of which specially the sandalwood was sold there dearly. Pieter Gerritsz Bourgonje found however when he later took note of the loading of the *Eendracht* that neither ship brought goods sufficient to supply all places on the Coast.

FRESH CONTRACT WITH GINGI.

According to the direction of the Directors, they had now to renew the treaty concluded by De Bitter. Maertssen therefore negotiated with the great Aya and this had the desired result. On the 29th March 1610, a contract was concluded between the Aya Tiere Wangelaye, Governor over the islands Tindamandalam on the one side and Arend Maertssen and Pieter Gerritsz Bourgonje on the other side. Herein was settled that Prince Maurice should have within the fortress of Tirupapuliyur, as a store house of ammunition and merchandise, the house called *Nota Calamatta Coin*. The Dutch were free to make what structural alterations they pleased provided they brought in the fort a metal half cannon and three iron guns. The Aya must help the Dutch against their enemies. The Dutch must pay 2 per cent. import and export duties except for money, rice, and other necessaries of the fort. The Aya must permit no Portuguese to dwell or trade in Tegnapatam or Tirupapuliyur. Neither side was to raise a religious dispute. The Aya was obliged to hand over deserters to the Dutch. The Nayak or the Aya should have the right to buy sulphur from the company for other merchants. The Aya should help the Dutch to compel the dyers and weavers to carry out their agreements with the Dutch. The Aya might permit no trade to other European nations who did not bring papers from His Princelike Excellency. The Dutch might also trade at Porto Novo. The goods which the Aya desired from the Netherlands, the Dutch should deliver to him at cost price. The Dutch must not disturb the ships which sailed to other places with passport of the Captain of Tegnapatam. If the Aya desired from the Captain passport for sending for goods of other places for particular use, they must give it. The Aya swore on his side to keep the contract with his Nayak Christoppen Aya.

Thus the Dutch secured contractual confirmation for their possession of Tirupapuliyur, and could use Tegnapatam as harbour for it. Porto Novo also stood open before them, but they did not establish a factory there immediately.

After the conclusion of the contract with the Aya, Arend Maertssen and Abraham Fontaine went also to the court to look further after the interests of Tirupapuliyur. Having alighted at Gingi they observed that unnecessary promises had been given by Bourgonje and Marcelis to the loss of the company. Neither of them was willing to go with the envoys of Gingi, probably because they felt guilty in this respect. Not before the 24th of April did Maertssen and Fontaine depart from Gingi taking with them a letter to the ruler of Holland, wherein the Aya promised to keep the contract concluded now and at the same time requested that ships might be sent to Tegnapatam.

The lodge at Tirupapuliyur was now strengthened with three iron guns and one half cannon according to the stipulation of the concluded treaty. The work of Arend Maertssen for the benefit of Tirupapuliyur was finished. He could look back at it with satisfaction. New bonds were laid in the kingdom of Gingi, and the old made stronger. (*Sources.* De Jonge, Heeres, Macleod and Terpstra.)

CHAPTER VI.

PULICAT.

A much more important result was to ensue from the three ships touching the Coast, i.e. the establishment of a factory in so highly important a place as Pulicat which was favourably situated with regard to cloth. Prices were lower than anywhere else. Before the Dutch actually established a factory at Pulicat, they obtained the cloth of that place through the merchant Godia Soheyder to whom heavy commissions had to be paid. Pulicat was also admirably situated in the middle of the Coast so that from there Dutch influence could spread north and south.

When Maertssen and Fontaine were in Gingi to look after the affairs of Tirupapuliyur, they sent at the same time the already concluded contract about this place for confirmation to the king of Karnatic with whom they had already entered into correspondence concerning the eventual establishment of the Dutchmen at Pulicat. On the 22nd April, they received a kind letter from the

great king who at the same time sent envoys with full power to conclude a contract with Maertssen about Pulicat. The contract was now sent again to Vellore to be confirmed by the king. On the 28th April, the Dutch at Tirupapuliyur also received, through envoys', the king's permission to enter into trade negotiations at Pulicat. Maertssen departed for Pulicat so that he might begin trade negotiations. On the 9th May he anchored there, and landed the following day. On the 15th May there came the contracts which had been sent from Gingi to Vellore, ratified by the king, while an envoy at the same time brought the written request that Maertssen should go to him that they might carry on further verbal negotiations. The contents of the contract that was thus brought back ratified was in short as follows :—

The Dutch shall have at Pulicat a stone house for ammunition and merchandise. 2 per cent. shall be paid for imports and exports except for gold, rice, and other necessaries for the house. The king shall hinder the Portuguese at Pulicat. On either side men shall not dispute about religious matters. The king shall hand over deserters to the Dutch. The king shall help the Dutch to compel dyers and weavers to fulfil their obligations with them. The king should permit no European merchants who do not bring documents from His Princelike Excellency. Such goods as the king desires from the Netherlands, shall be delivered by the Dutch to him at cost price. The Dutch should not molest ships which sail from there to other places with passports from their Captain.

To comply with the request that the king had caused to be brought by his envoy, Arend Maertssen left for Vellore on the 21st May accompanied by Abraham Fontaine. They did not need to finish the journey. In a village called by the Dutch "Cauveripaque" about eight miles from Vellore, they met the king who came to welcome the Dutch envoys with a large cavalry and infantry. But the king departed in the night for Vellore. He was desirous that the Dutch should see "his magnificent and kingly state, his superb castles and antique edifices". His nobles said it would be no small disgrace for him to give audience to the Dutch and send them away in a village as he now stood in alliance with the ruler of Holland. They came to Vellore on the 27th of May. Three days later, he secured audience. The results were satisfactory, yet troublesome. The Portuguese had sent their priests with presents and offered 5,000 pagodas to the brother-in-law of the Nayak for driving away the Dutch from Pulicat. One of the councillors of the Nayak was so far persuaded that he proposed that the Dutch might be given another harbour instead, but the Nayak said that he would not break his pledged word and refused the enticing offer.

Thus the Dutch secured a footing at Pulicat.[1] Hans Marcelis was left there as senior merchant for the space of one or two years on a monthly salary of 62 guilders. As junior merchant was left Abraham Fontaine who, though he had hoped to go higher, was willing to accommodate himself to the arrangement. They received also three others as administrators of the new lodge. The number does not appear too large for such a promising establishment.

Maertssen's ship, the *Little Sun*, was already departed for Masulipatam before the court journey of the two envoys, and he himself now followed thither. He came on the 18th June very much contented with the negotiations carried on about Pulicat. Here the factors were involved in serious trouble. The trade was simply forbidden, and the lodge beset with soldiers so that nobody could speak with the Dutch. On the 21st or 22nd July Marcelis was called from his bed and beaten with his dependents, the door of the lodge was pulled out, and, to the greatest dismay of the factors, the natives took from it weapons and all that they wished to take. When this incident came to the king's ear, he was indignant with the conduct of the Sabandhar and chose the Dutch side. He sent the governess of the Queen named Condema who was the mother of the Sabandhar to Pulicat so that she might bring her son with the Dutch deputy to Vellore where the matter might be further investigated. They reached the place on the 29th July. Whether it was that Marcelis and his officers did not feel wholly innocent with regard to this matter, or whether it was that they feared that the mother of the Sabandhar in any case would work against the Dutch to the benefit of her son, it was decided that they should honour her with a present of no less than 100 reals of eight, 1½ man sandalwood, 5 damask and 2 armosijnnen.

The question of giving a present to the king led to complications elsewhere. The broker, Lingana, who had carried out his negotiations with success returned from Kandy with two elephants, one big and one small. But he came not to Tegnapatam but to Pulicat. Lingana was a friend of Marcelis. At Porto Novo, Lingana learned that Marcelis was senior merchant at Pulicat. Also he was afraid of going to Tegnapatam as he had greatly blamed to the king of Kandy a servant of the Aya who had been in Kandy. Hence Lingana felt that he would rather please his friend at Pulicat with the present than run the chance of being unpleasantly taken prisoner at

[1] Pieris, *The Dutch Power in Ceylon*. ' When the Raja of Vellore permitted them to build a factory at Pullicatt they wrote on the 26th May 1610 to the new Sinhalese king, Senerirat, that " this king has made an eternal treaty with our Prince Mauritius de Nassau, whereby the king allowed and granted us free trade in all his territories and to live in them." '

Tegnapatam. The Nayak of Gingi was in any case aggrieved that while he was in need of the so much desired present, they in Pulicat had the disposal of it. Originally Marcelis and his companions thought of selling the elephants to the great king. But the Masulipatam factors felt that political considerations must override the desire for gain and that it would be much better for the youngest establishment of the Dutch that they gave the king a royal present than they should clearly show themselves as gain-seeking merchants. The council of Masulipatam wrote in this spirit to Pulicat where it was now decided that they should take the elephants with them as a present to the king on a journey to the court. Therefore the governess came to the spot to fetch the same. With that 1 kandy and 15 ratel (arabipond) sandalwood, 1½ man mace, three baskets small porcelain cups, 18 damasks and 800 or 900 reals of eight were to be taken as presents.

Hans Marcelis and Abraham Fontaine were the envoys to go to the court of Vellore. The journey took a longer time than was expected. Although the Dutch having come to Vellore waited at the court daily from morning till evening, they succeeded in speaking with the king for the first time only on the 30th August. The king showed himself in the town and as the people showed their great enthusiasm with firing of guns, shouts and tears. Marcelis and Fontaine did not know better than to participate in these tokens of homage though with so little of heart. When they succeeded in securing the king's ear, he promised to summon them in a couple of days and place another Sabandhar at Pulicat. A further audience was daily delayed. Meanwhile the Portuguese, seeing their chance fair, gave to the king a beautiful elephant, two horses and other presents and 5,000 pagodas to the king's brother-in-law and represented to him that, as the Dutch kept Pulicat, the trade in San Thome must inevitably go down. The king was thus again brought to waver. He as well as his brother-in-law Narpraga and his commander-in-chief Obbe Raja temporarily offered to the envoys another place instead of Pulicat. Van Wesick who was written to for counsel strongly advised Marcelis that they should not allow themselves to be persuaded to abandon Pulicat for another place in the neighbourhood. Luckily it did not go so far.

Owing to a dispute between Narpraga and the Captain, the Dutch were not detained for a long time. When this was made up by the king they formally obtained a last audience. The promise that Pulicat should have another Sabandhar with a controller was renewed. The toll should be reduced from 2 to 1½%. Marcelis and Fontaine received two palanquins and two rings and were taken triumphantly through the town—a great regret for the Portuguese and other

enemies of the Dutch. The Dutch were also presented with a village, an hour's distance from Pulicat, named Averipaique. Owing to the slowness of the Secretary who had to prepare their letters, they could depart from Vellore only on the 26th September. On the journey back, Marcelis and Fontaine visited the Commander Obbe Raja, in the place Sataiour as the village Averipaque lay in his territory. He immediately gave the Dutch the letter of possession and besides on his own initiative the place Cavecantoure lying on the river of Pulicat so that they might trade there paying for duty $\frac{3}{4}$%—quite an equitable figure. Further he gave the Dutch free trade in the whole of his territory. Also, from his side, a governess should go with them to inspect with them a place which might seem good to them. Yea, he even offered them an island lying a little near the coast, to provide a harbour at his own cost, and to provide the Dutch more money for carrying trade in his lands. Marcelis and Fontaine did not immediately accept the offer of Obbe Raja, saying that they were not allowed to take any place without giving information first to their admiral. The further offers which the general caused to be made when Willem Janssen had landed at Pulicat had also no more result. On the 2nd October Marcelis and Fontaine returned from their important mission and were received in a friendly way by the new Sabandhar.

Although there was thus reason for contentment at Pulicat, in Tirupapuliyur great anger prevailed over the elephant question. The Aya was furious and would not stand any word from Bourgonje when he rode to him. The Aya was inclined to conclude friendship with the Dutch only if they gave the desired elephants or the money for which they would have sold the elephant to the king of Vellore. This was what the factors who went to negotiate with him over the matter gathered. Marcelis does not appear to have possessed those qualities which were necessary for a good factory keeper of the company. He was not over-honest. He offered in the name of the Senior merchant a price which was too low for a consignment of about 150 dyed Sarassa. The merchant declined to sell. Then Marcelis in his own name offered more and brought the Sarassa by the back door of the lodge and by the window and kept it in his own room. In addition to his dishonesty, he showed great discourtesy to the local authorities and thus imperilled the interests of the company.[1] Although the other officers could do nothing against Marcelis, they wrote

[1] On the 3rd October a day after his return, with an exaggerated sense of power, he went to the new Sabandhar in the bankshall and caused the dyers to call there, which the Sabandhar considered as very discourteous. Fontaine and Hendrikzoon Clock brought to his notice that men should not thus speak to those people. He answered that this could not be otherwise.

to Van Wesick and Willem Janssen earnestly lamenting the conduct of their superior. This letter did not make Marcelis turn a new leaf. He was unfriendly to every one except the broker Lingana. The people in the house wrote that they could keep no house with Marcelis. Two days after the composition of this letter Fontaine joined and also wrote a letter in which in veiled language he made known his dissatisfaction with Marcelis.

On the receipt of Fontaine's letter, the Council of Masulipatam and Petapoeli sent Willem Janssen to Pulicat with full power to set things in order there. He left Masulipatam on the 2nd November by the yacht *Little Middleborgh* and landed on the 10th at Pulicat. Here six days later a resolution was taken which was signed by Marcelis also. The future was thus settled. The Senior merchant was not to set a bad example to his subordinates. He was not, by speaking unreasonably of the Sabandhar, to give reason to his people and the natives of the place to say anything bad of the Dutch. When he acted against this, the under-merchant should immediately intimate this to the factory of Masulipatam. The Senior merchant should hide nothing in his papers and books from the Junior merchant on pain of the utmost displeasure of the Directors. He was not to buy or sell goods without a resolution of his council. He must give satisfactory instructions to the Junior merchant and the assistants about the cloth trade. Promises and presents should be made only by resolution of the council. In the last half of November, Willem Janssen probably left Pulicat. By his mediation, affairs in this factory were placed on a satisfactory basis.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CLOSE OF AN EPOCH

Meanwhile an important change had taken place in north Coromandel. Pieter Ysaacx while proceeding overland from Petapoeli to Masulipatam was tempted by the heat to drink too much.[1] This proved fatal. His corpse was brought to Masulipatam where his sad unexpected death received the sincere sympathy of Moors and Hindus. Here was buried Pieter Ysaacx, the man who had spent the last years of his life for the establishment of the Dutch trade on the Coast. He did not in the least injure the interests of

[1] After he had drunk two 'mingeler huy' ('huy is wei van melk wuar de kasstof wit is'), he died within two hours under the phenomenon of inward bleeding.—MACLEOD, vol. i, p. 94.

the Company, and this cannot be said of all the other Senior merchants.

The death of Pieter Ysaacx came at a most unsuitable time. It was the time to finish the shipping of the cloth, and the Portuguese would seize the opportunity to do all possible harm to the Dutch. Things had to be done quickly. The council of the ships decided to appoint Van Wesick in place of Ysaacx so that he might be authorized to take action as Senior merchant in Masulipatam, and President of Petapoeli. Pieter Jelis Van Ravensteyn should succeed Van Wesick in Petapoeli as under-merchant there, while Adolf Thomassen, assistant at Masulipatam, took Ravensteyn's place. Although Van Wesick would have willingly left the coast, yet he realized that the death of Pieter Ysaacx had made the situation particularly critical. He therefore found it good to stay on for a year.

The question was now raised whether it was necessary to continue the Golconda factories seeing that the strong support of the capable Pieter Ysaacx had dropped and that they could carry on trade at Pulicat where there was abundance of cloth to be obtained. It was worth considering whether the heavy charges necessary for the maintenance of four lodges might not be dropped. In fact it was seriously proposed to suspend the trade at Petapoeli when once they had an established position and free trade at Pulicat. Regarding the suspension of Masulipatam, however it was somehow decided otherwise. In the selfsame letter to Bantam wherein Van Wesick reported the death of Pieter Ysaacx, he declared decidedly against abandoning Masulipatam, and for three reasons :—

(1) Much gain could be made from the merchandise which used to be bought earlier by the Portuguese, viz., cloves, mace, nutmegs, porcelain, sandalwood and spialter.
(2) Masulipatam remained of importance for the securing of the white cloth which could be procured here better than in Pulicat in which place the painted cloth was best obtained.
(3) Van Wesick thought it a no small matter that they could enjoy the indigo trade.

Position of Dutch Business on the Coast since the coming of the Dutch Ships.

Pulicat promised most for the company. The prices of the cloth were low there, and Marcelis wrote on the 23rd November 1610 'If we had ten times more capital and money to spend in cloth, it should not have been otherwise used'. No wonder that at this busy place Marcelis required a large cargo for carrying on trade. Regarding the wares which would be desired by the natives, they should be able to sell there lead, tin, sulphur, camphor, nutmegs, mace, cloves,

sandalwood, long pepper, white and black benzoin, musk, red scarlet violet and silk 'laeck' while they could also deal in porcelain cups, tortoise shell, quicksilver and leaf brass. There was also great need for money. The consignment of 8,000 reals left in the factory was soon spent and Pulicat had to depend on other factories. Fortunately, this was granted. From Masulipatam on the 10th September 1,000 pagodas were received in cash, mirrors, needles and other wares. With the yacht *Cleyn Middleborgh* wherewith Willem Janssen departed for Pulicat, 2,000 pagodas were also sent, while it was also decided to use for the good of Pulicat some money which was originally intended for repairing the *Eendracht* as they had decided to burn the ship. At Tirupapuliyur also they were making progress. Merchants came freely so that it seemed likely to be a good staple place for cloth. They were also busy there (May 1610) with the building of a new house which it was hoped would be finished in two months. Sandalwood and sulphur were sold there at high prices. Hans Marcelis in his letter to the Directors of the Chamber, Amsterdam, claims to have done a mighty lot for its prosperity. He had so far brought round the dyers and weavers that they made the Javanese and Malay clothes better than in Petapoeli, while the prices were considerably lower. The indigo at Tegnapatam was also nearly twice as cheap as in Masulipatam, though the quality was much inferior. Bourgonje, the head of the factory, could not swallow his discontent that that flourishing factory should still be always placed under Masulipatam.

In the North Coromandel the old questions were still hanging fire. Van Wesick's journey to Golconda had led to no definite results in the matter of the stamp duty. The matter had been dropped provisionally in the hope that with the coming of the Dutch ships an envoy should be sent to Golconda in the name of the Dutch to settle the dispute. This hope was not fulfilled and so they had to come to terms with the natives. As there was no definite agreement with the Governors of Petapoeli and Masulipatam, the Dutch by a present had secured as permanent law the provisional toll of 4 per cent. without further claim, while they could not help making a present to Mirsumela for the redemption of the stamp duty. Now that the toll question was solved for good, the Governor of Masulipatam asked to be allowed to buy all the newly brought goods for 3,000 pagodas for the king; if it was too much and he could not get the whole, he must at least be given cargoes for 1,000 pagodas; without permission of the Governors, no trade was actually possible in Masulipatam and Petapoeli. Sometimes merchants came secretly at night to do business with Dutch factors but they were severely punished if they

were caught. What the Governors themselves furnished to the Dutch was bad because the weavers were not sufficiently rewarded, but the factory keepers were compelled to receive the same so that they might not be continually regarded as guilty. For Van Wesick it was almost impossible to prevent the smuggling trade which was carried on by the Dutch themselves. He rightly thought the situation gloomy. It is thus seen that North Coromandel was burdened and careworn though Ravensteyn wanted to see if any good might come from the change in the native government of Masulipatam which was effected in 1610. (In place of one Governor who farmed the administration, more persons were appointed by the king to govern Masulipatam.) The ships *Ternate* and *Cleyne Sonne* which reached Bantam in September and October 1610 together brought 292 packs of Coromandel cloth, 24 bales indigo, and 39 packs Guzerat linen. Of the Coromandel cloth, 151 packs were shipped in Petapoeli while 24 packs of yarn were probably from Tirupapuliyur. When the *Ternate* came to Bantam, men suspected that the crew had cloth on their bodies. Strict investigation was made. But all the same, it was decided that the offenders rather than being punished need only be deprived of price of their cloth.

Tanjore

In a letter of the 26th July 1610, Bourgonje mentions the negotiations with the Nayak of Tanjore for securing the place of Trimelipatam for Dutch trade. He wrote to Van Wesick that men daily expected a caul from the Nayak of Tanjore as the ambassador of the above named Nayak had promised to Astapa, the interpreter of the Dutch, to send within five or six weeks two cauls dealing with Trimelipatam, one to be sent to their admiral, and the other to be preserved in Tirupapuliyur. Much was expected of the cloth trade at Trimelipatam although it was found that a pair of cloths bought as samples there was somewhat dear.

Relations with Kandy

Carolus de Lannoy returned from Kandy to Masulipatam on the 29th of June after having concluded a treaty. The king expected speedy help against the Portuguese from the Dutch especially in view of the presents of elephants which he had made to the latter. De Lannoy had also promised help. An envoy from the king at Pulicat repeatedly urged the sending of a couple of envoys to speak about the measures that ought to be taken according to the concluded treaty. Thereupon it was decided that again Carolus de Lannoy with two others as helpers should depart with the envoy

from Kandy, and from Pulicat they wrote to Tegnapatam to send as speedily as possible the patent of His Princelike Excellency. On the 21st November instructions were given at Pulicat to De Lannoy in accordance with which he had to carry out the embassy to Kandy. He must take a patent with him by way of thanks for the elephant and testify to his regret at affairs not getting speeded up as Maertssen had not taken to Bantam the concluded contract. It would be taken for His Princelike Excellency by the *Cleyn Middleborgh* which ship should depart on the 23rd November. Willem Janssen should further state to the Admiral and his council the affairs concerning Ceylon. De Lannoy should take 125 pagodas in money and rough cloth as journey money. The Dutch ships which might go to Ceylon, he must permit in February or at the latest March of the next year to return to Pulicat, where he was to be satisfied and accounts settled.

Relations with Arakan.

The king of Arakan who all along expected assistance from the Dutch found to his regret that no help ever came in the year 1609. He now sent an envoy Gytacor with a ring as present to Masulipatam, once more to ask help of the Dutch. They did not feel much inclined to send another expedition. The first voyage happened because of the pressure of circumstances, but now that they had a firm footing on the Coast, the repetition of it did not seem to be necessary. The king of Arakan appeared to have reached a very helpless and powerless condition. Finally, they decided in spite of the relatively little profits that they stood to gain from it to send a new embassy to Arakan. When Carolus de Lannoy refused to take this up, Jacob Dirks Cortenhoeff, assistant in Masulipatam was found for it. He left on the 11th September 1610 with three other Dutchmen, taking with him 1,200 pagodas as cargo. Van Wesick, Willem Janssen and Antony Schorer gave him an instruction which was unusually careful. He must represent that they were so long unable to respond to the appeals for help which Pieter Willemsz had taken with him. The sudden death of Pieter Ysaacx added to their difficulties. Now, he, Cortenhoeff was finally come to contract with His Majesty. Cortenhoeff must request free trade in all the lands of the king under his protection. With the patent of His Princelike Excellency that promised help against the Spaniards and Portuguese (which would not probably reward the trouble), he must be careful in handling affairs according to the requirements of the case. Further, Cortenhoeff must declare that as the truce progressed, they could not help the king. They could not help against De Brito

without the decision of the admiral in each case. On all sides they thus held themselves free. Cortenhoeff must collect the quantity of rice that the king of Arakan owed to Pieter Willemsz. Thus this was an embassy undertaken with anything but enthusiasm.

THE PORTUGUESE FURY AND DISQUIET.

With rising fury and disquiet at the same time, the Portuguese saw how gradually the Dutch power spread on the Coast of Coromandel and threatened to stifle their establishments in Negapatam and San Thome. By their intrigues they sought to disturb the Dutch negotiations with the inland princes. By force of arms also they made an attempt to re-establish their greatly reduced authority on the coast. A number of Portuguese ships came on the 29th of May in sight of Pulicat. In place of success, this undertaking caused them only damage and shame. Two vessels with the Portuguese were taken, and the sailors imprisoned. Sailing to Masulipatam, the Portuguese had no better luck. Having come there on the 7th of June, they were disappointed in their purpose of preventing the Dutch ships unloading and taking cargo. They had already taken their cargo. They wished then to hinder the sailing out of the loaded ships. But the Dutch already took the places from where they must fetch drinking water, took two of their vessels, and imprisoned three Portuguese so that the enemy disappeared on the 11th June with their purposes unperformed. After this before the year was out, the Dutch once more received news indeed incomplete and indistinct about seven fusts which should attack the road of Pulicat. It was only natural that the Portuguese should employ all their power to trick the Dutch out of Pulicat. They had no good port in San Thome and Pulicat with the river that flowed into the sea was admirably suitable for their ships.

NEED FOR UNITY FOR THE DUTCH SETTLEMENTS ON THE COAST.

The Dutch establishments had already embraced so much of the coast that unity was necessary so that there might be a head to deal with the enemies, to resist all the craft and unreliableness of the natives as also the unceasing plots of the Portuguese. It was necessary that one person should be appointed to exercise authority with a strong hand over all the four establishments. Luckily they had not to wait much for the change. In Bantam where they had received the news by the *Little Sun* and *Ternate* that their sphere of influence had spread out and that they had to fight with many troubles, they saw the compelling necessity of having a common head over all places to regulate with better order the purchase of cloth and other things. Also there was the need of

merchandise on the Coast. On the 1st October, 1610 Wemmer Van Berchem was come in Bantam as the commander of the yacht the *Hasewindt* to bring the important news that at Antwerp the twelve years' truce was concluded, that outside Europe it should commence a year after the signature of the treaty. The *Hasewindt* was to bring there news of the twelve years' truce and at the same time to mark out some one as head of all the factories on the coast. They did not however in Bantam feel themselves completely justified independently to choose anybody for so weighty an office. They preferred rather to await the coming of the Governor-General Pieter Both, who was soon expected. As the Governor-General had not however arrived by December, the High Council on the 3rd December unanimously chose Jan Wesick, Senior Merchant of Masulipatam and Petapoeli. The council of the yacht the *Hasewindt* had to move him as general head to be willing to prolong his stay on the coast which had already lasted so long. Hendrik Van Westereenen should accompany to be used in place of Van Wesick for securing information about local trade possibilities while at the same time Marcelis, Michielsz Boshouwer and Jan Graeff should serve as factors on the coast. 42,000 reals of eight should be sent with the yacht for the coast. Much more was necessary here, but the yacht was not defensible enough to be used for all remittances of money, so that men did not dare to entrust it with a larger sum of money than the above and therewith 8,000 reals for Atjeh.

When Van Westereenen now became sick, the High Council decided that Juan de Labistrate should go with the yacht in his place to the coast. Yet the Governor-General did not come, and so the High Council at Bantam put forward on its own authority instructions for the Director of the trade of the Coast of Coromandel and other places lying thereabout. These were in the main as follow :—

The Directors desired that a general head should be appointed over the Coromandel for which Jacob Van Groenewegen or, failing him, Jacques l'Hermite de Jonge was to be nominated. As, however, Van Groenewegen perished by being murdered in Banda and l'Hermite could not be spared from Bantam, Van Wesick was appointed to this office. He must reside at Pulicat and with the council of the yacht choose such a council as time and opportunity should permit. To the Governor-General, he must send a memoir that gave information about (1) The practicability of the plan suggested by Van Soldt to carry on trade from Masulipatam to Cambay with camels and (2) The question how they could most conveniently secure the indigo from the neighbourhood of Lahore and Agra. Attention must be devoted to the trade possibilities in Bengal. The smuggling of cloth required sharp supervision. Of those who were already on the

coast one must now finally be delegated as ambassador to Golconda. If Petapoeli could not be wholly discontinued, as few people as possible should remain in service.

Besides De Labistrate and the under-merchant Boshouwer, two assistants also proceeded to the Coromandel Coast. Van Wesick was to place these where need was found. Besides the instructions, a letter was sent to Van Wesick wherein his good conduct at the death of Pieter Ysaacx was commended. It was mentioned as a reason for his appointment as head and continual president over all the factories and places on the coast. With the yacht came as cargo, besides the above mentioned reals of eight and the sandalwood, a quantity of porcelain, alum, speauter [1] and some lac and " Korseys ".

More letters were also taken by the *Hasewindt* to Bourgonje and Marcelis wherein they were informed of the appointment of Van Wesick as their superior. To him they should in future be accountable. Also De Labistrate himself carried with him an instruction which appointed him to the place of Van Wesick in case he did not accept the offered office or was perhaps dead. In Tegnapatam especially he must institute a sharp investigation about the state of affairs as so much disorder prevailed. If the under-merchant Jacob Steyl should somehow be spared from there, he must come back with the yacht, and any other who is sober and competent must be appointed in his place.

In this way the *Hasewindt* was despatched to the Coast. With justice might men hope that the colony should meet a period of prosperity. Surprise attacks on the Portuguese were no longer thought to be necessary as the truce prevented both parties from spreading their influence other than along peaceful ways. A powerful central government, it was hoped, would bring in the factories the order and the unity which had so frequently been wanting. As headquarters was chosen Pulicat, that was to remain for many years the seat of the government of Coromandel. The establishments on the Coast continued to expand but it could be rightly said that the foundation period of Dutch authority on the Coromandel ended with the establishment of the central government at Pulicat. Van Wesick accepted the office offered to him, and filled it till 1612. The situation was now distinctly favourable for the Dutch who had several bases on the Coast. Of their European rivals, the Portuguese were not receiving reinforcements and the English were hindered by shortage of capital and want of support from home.

[1] A mixture of lead, brass and tin perhaps also zinc. (*Vide* Verwijs and Verdam : Middel Nederlandsch woorden boek).

CHAPTER VIII.

FRESH EMBASSIES TO GOLCONDA AND VELLORE.

In 1609 Their High Mightinesses, the States General of the United Provinces, made a truce for twelve years with Spain. It was agreed among other matters that the same should take place also in the East Indies. The Directors of the Dutch Company requested Their High Mightinesses and His Highness the Prince to send letters to all Indian kings and princes requesting them to enter into a confederacy with the Dutch. This was granted. Pieter Both, the first Governor-General of the Indies, was given full power to enter into such alliances with all the Indian kings and princes as this was thought most expedient for the settling of their commerce and the ruining of that of the Portuguese. According to the secret treaty of 1609, the king of Spain undertook not to interfere with the Dutch trade wherever carried on. Thus access to the Indies was conceded though, to save appearances, the word was not used. The commercial rivalry in the East was so acute that the situation in the East remained practically unaffected by the new diplomatic understanding concluded in Europe. The experience, ability and resourcefulness of the early Governors-General led the Dutch to success. Hence the Dutch Empire was extended and consolidated at the expense of the Portuguese, Spaniards, and the English. Although the Dutch were a nation of merchants who through humility had become rich, their activities in these early years did not always indicate a peaceful character.

COROMANDEL.

No information is available about Coromandel for the year 1611. In the middle of 1611 Wemmer Van Berchem departed from Bantam to the coast of Coromandel. He reached Masulipatam in the following year and relieved Jan Van Wesick as the Director of Coromandel where there were now at least four factories situated in four different parts namely, Tegnapatnam (with Tirupapuliyūr), Pulicat, Petapoeli and Masulipatam.

The Portuguese did not content themselves with making presents to native rulers and thus thwarting the Dutch. They openly resorted to violence. On the 9th July 1612 they came with vessels from San Thome to Pulicat and made themselves masters of the house of the Company with all goods, and brought these with the merchant Adolf Thomasz and six others whom they had taken prisoners to San Thome. Three Dutchmen perished in the fight. The difficulties which Van Berchem had to face were manifold. The Government

of the company had not seen the necessity of defending them with armed might, nor had they given him sufficient cash for maintaining the fight against the Portuguese. In addition to these, the vexations of the Muhammadan Governors of Masulipatam and other harbours belonging to Golconda which had already been practised during the time of Van Wesick continued. This was the reason why Van Berchem started for Golconda on the 23rd July with gifts to the king, Sultan Abdullah, and the great Moors according to the prevalent custom.

Embassy to Golconda.

As soon as he reached Golconda, Van Berchem was informed of what had happened at Pulicat. Naturally this at once lowered the prestige of the Dutch at Golconda while at the same time the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa tried by presents in Golconda to bring about the ruin of Dutch factories there. Through the intervention of the king, there came an Armenian merchant from Masulipatam asking for the restoration of the vessel called *Tanazsary* that had been seized by the Dutch as prize because it had Portuguese cargo on board. This cargo was under orders from Golconda stored at Masulipatam. On the 10th August Van Berchem obtained audience with the Sultan. He complained of the treatment which the Dutch had already for five or six years experienced at Masulipatam and spoke of the breaking of the armistice by the Portuguese. This was a fault on the part of Van Berchem for Golconda had nothing to do with Pulicat. The Chancellor Mirjumla wittily remarked that in his land the Portuguese had done no harm to the Dutch and that hostilities were not permitted there. For this reason he desired that the cargo was given back to the Armenian because the vessel was lost in his neutral harbour, a point of war law which Van Berchem naturally called in question.

The government of Golconda on their side had also a just grievance against the company. In 1606 the Dutch had promised that each year ships should come to Masulipatam with goods and rarities like different woven stuffs, earth work, etc. Previously the Portuguese had brought them, but the Dutch did not keep to their promise though they had great fame and name and their ships were well provided with guns and munitions of war. Therefore it was better for them to grant trade rights to the Portuguese rather than the Dutch. The remark was just, and Van Berchem could only answer that all that the Portuguese brought to India except sugar, oil and Spanish wine were carried from Holland to Portugal, and that, with the next coming ships, the company would bring such

goods to the king if payment was provided for. Thereupon the king and the Council, relying upon the friendship of the Dutch Prince, requested the restitution of the goods of the Armenian. Three firmans had been solemnly issued by the king on that matter and to revoke them would be a curse. Van Berchem did not deem it proper to answer that the matter was of little importance. He complained about the enmity of the Portuguese which invited him to vengeance but the king intimated that this must be done at sea away from the coast and not in his neutral land. After this audience, Van Berchem spent eleven days in laying the Dutch request before Mir Mohamad Momi, second person in the Council more favourable to the Dutch than the others, Mir Jumla, Mirkasim, brother-in-law of the Sultan, Mir ek and Mirsajet, principal councillors to the ambassadors of Bijapur and other kingdoms while the Portuguese went about distributing presents. Van Berchem made himself an unfortunate figure when on his second audience on the 22nd he must have known to his shame that he had very little to offer to the Sultan. What made it so much the worse was that he had at the same time presented a petition for being permitted to buy up the import and export duties of Masulipatam for a fixed annual sum so that he might thus escape the knaveries of the Governors. Nevertheless the government was prepared to permit the sale for 3,000 pagodas, but they remained pressing on for the restoration of the Armenian's cargo. Van Berchem knowing that he must submit to such a demand wished to go, but experienced a new difficulty. Till the 31st August he waited twice daily on Mir Mohamed Momi and Mir Jumla for securing a firman from the Sultan permiting their departure. But he did not receive the document as the Chancellor wished to secure a loan of 1,000 pagodas without giving an acknowledgment of debt. For taking counsel Van Berchem sent his assistant Hendrick de Groen to Masulipatam so that he might communicate the situation to the council there. De Groen took two beautiful horses which were meant for the Sultan of Atjeh. He was to go from Atjeh to Bantam to intimate to the Governor-General the affairs of Coromandel. This unusual commission makes us suppose that Van Berchem did not feel at ease. There was more reason for this as he had learned reliably that the Portuguese Viceroy, under promise of a large sum of money, had made a written request to the Sultan to make the "Dutchmen and thieves" depart from Masulipatam. Several councillors of the king advised him to give heed to this. But Mir Mohamad Momi was against this, and luckily the king gave heed to this.

Meanwhile Van Berchem continued vainly asking for his passports until finally on the 12th September a person from whom he

could not well have expected it came to his help. The king's buffoon came to him at midday and requested him for one of his clothes. The request was complied with on a promise by the buffoon that he would present himself therewith to the king and remind him that Van Berchem had received no firman from Mir Jumla for his departure. The buffoon now went to the court dressed more like a Frenchman or an Englishman than a Persian. This effort was successful. For his services the buffoon was given in 1616 a present consisting of a piece of red velvet and a mirror. Van Berchem was immediately summoned by the Chancellor who was now prepared to give an acknowledgment of debt for the present and promised a passport within two days. On the 15th he received a firman and besides that a letter of credence to the Governor and others at Masulipatam who had been troubling the Dutch, calling on them to show proper honour and respect to the Dutch there. From English documents we learn that the Dutch had procured with great charges and diverse embassies to Golconda which caused their company about 20,000 reals to pay to the king 3,000 pagodas which is above 4,000 reals per annum for the custom of the in-coming and out-going goods at Masulipatam; also they must pay the said sum whether ships came or not, and it was but for that place only, for in Petapoeli they paid 3½ per cent. where in former times the Dutch had to pay 5 per cent. The native authorities made up for this in another way by buying inferior goods and making vile payments in goods unvendible and at excessive prices, and by abasing the price of the European goods. Though the Dutch prevented many of these inconveniences by reason of their costly firmans of the king, yet, they did not altogether escape, but were also sufficiently plagued.[1]

On the 16th September Van Berchem took leave from the above named lords. He departed on the 17th and came back to Masulipatam on the 23rd with the firman. His absence of just two months was thus not without fruit. The Armenian merchant also received a firman declaring that the goods taken from him and kept in the bankshall should be given back to him.

Van Berchem and Pulicat.

On the 8th September were anchored before Pulicat the ships *The Star* and *The Green Lion* coming from the Netherlands and belonging

[1] *Vide* letter of Lucas Antheunis of Masulipatam to Sir Thomas Roe dated Masulipatam the first and fifteenth February 1615 (1616) in Foster's *English Factories*. This letter also throws light on the English fear of Dutch rivalry and of Portuguese designs on Coromandel. (See Appendix No. 2).

to the fleet of the commander Adriaen Blocq Martensz. They brought with them letters of the 14th December 1611.

Now, not being powerless, Van Berchem could attend to the pressing request of the Governors, the Sabandhar and the inhabitants to set up again the factory that had been destroyed by the Portuguese. With the *Starre* that had gone to Masulipatam he departed on the 5th November to Pulicat and from there on the 2nd December with Andries Criecke and six others to Vellore for invoking the co-operation of the Naik of Karnataka. He took with him the presents which the Directors had sent with the abovenamed ships for the Nayak of Gingi who was thus once more deprived of his gifts as earlier of elephants. The Naik of Karnataka promised to send his brother-in-law Narpradja with some thousand soldiers by land to San Thome if Van Berchem attacked the place by water. He gave a firman with the " hand of sandal " to build a fort of which the half should belong to the company while they could make a house themselves.[1] Also taught by the experience with Golconda, Van Berchem sought and obtained permission to do injury to the Portuguese in the harbours of Karnataka. He departed from Vellore honoured with a present, a palanquin and silk.

FURTHER SAFEGUARDS.

Van Berchem had not however much faith in the Nayak's promise and required security from the minister Djagaradja who was carrying on war probably against Mysore. So he went on horse with some horsemen to Kolar which he reached on the 27th. The Portuguese were already at work against the Dutch with promise of 100,000 pagodas for not allowing the Dutch at Pulicat. But Van Berchem succeeded by spending some money on presents to get a kaul from Djagaradja, and also the usual silks and the income of three villages which had stood under the factory of Pulicat, but were taken back. On the 6th January 1613 he was back at Pulicat and continued the re-building of the fort which had already been commenced by the natives.

CHAPTER IX.

PERILS AND DISORDERS ON THE COAST.

(*a*) PULICAT AND FURTHER PERILS.

FURTHER PORTUGUESE OUTRAGES.

The Portuguese offered 1,000 pagodas to the Ayya (Aja) or Commander-in-Chief of Gingi for driving the Dutch out of Tegnapatnam and handing over the head of the factory Franco Van der

[1] For full text of treaty, see Appendix No. 3.

Meer to them. Hence the Ayya obtained 2,000 rix dollars from V.D. Meer. Van Berchem sent there the *Groenen Leeuw* (*Green Lion*) to lend the necessary help and to cruise around Ceylon for securing the Portuguese vessels. On the 31st January the *Star* was also sent to Tegnapatam.

Notwithstanding all opposition, the fort was now complete and Van Berchem called it Geldria, after his native province.[1]

Thus defended, Pulicat could soon become a great trade centre. For in consequence of the kaul (firman) given to the Dutch, whereby a regular trade was assured, ships came yearly from Arakan, Tanasari, Pegu, Bengal and other lands for selling and buying wares.

But the Portuguese did not give up their efforts to frustrate the plans of the Dutch. Before the fort was furnished with weapons, they bribed Ite-radja, the brother of Djagaradja who went with 600 or 700 men to Pulicat and did not listen to the commands from Vellore to give up the undertaking. Their attacks were however beaten off twice by the soldiers of the Sjahbandar and crew of the *Der Goes* under the Schipper Cornelis Reijersz Schoon Hooffman so that Ite-radja withdrew.

The Portuguese attempted to poison the Dutch factors at Pulicat by sending slaves and others who pretended that they had fled from San Thome. Two were detected, tried and executed.

On the 17th July, 1613 Van Berchem returned to Masulipatam, Samuel Kindt remaining as head of the factory and commander in Geldria.

Continued Portuguese Naval Attacks and Defeats.

The Portuguese of San Thome had 2,000 armed persons and 1,000 peons ready with pickaxes and ladders to proceed to Geldria overland while they gave presents to the Governors and secured their permission. The *Groener Leeuw* was sent to Pulicat where already the *Sterre* was. But owing to the outbreak of the South-West Monsoon the *Leeuw* had to return without performing anything. Meanwhile a squadron from Goa was come for San Thome and Pulicat. Eight vessels were in action with the *Star*. They were lost

[1] Out of the ships *Der Goes*, *Starre*, *Groenen Leeuw* and *Duyffken*, Geldria, was provided with 10 iron pieces some "bassen", stone pieces and other weapons while out of their crew 70 men were placed in the fort. It was properly made a big thing by the natives who had begun it. Its circumference was 143 roods (535 metres), thus a polygon of more or less 170 metres as diameter. The walls were 1 rood and eight feet (about 6 metres high) and the bulwarks 1 rood and 10 ft. high. Van Berchem estimated that 200 men were necessary for defence, but he asked from Bantam on the first opportunity 150 soldiers with 8 or 10 cannon, 150 swords and 100 muskets.

after many deaths and injuries. They were repulsed and driven to Bengal, Pegu and wherever the wind sailed. Nothing more is mentioned of the attack on land.

Adolf Thomasz, after a year in prison, escaped, files having been sent from Pulicat sewn to mules. He afterwards fled to Kovelong, a couple of miles (Dutch miles) from San Thome—that belonged to the dominion of the queen of Karnataka. When sometime later Samuel Kindt was stationed at Masulipatam, Thomasz remained at Masulipatam as commander.

Unusually heavy rains ravaged the South Coromandel from 29th December, 1613 to 2nd February, 1614 so that everywhere the earthen walls of fortifications were destroyed, also those of Geldria besides 17 soldiers' houses. As soon as Van Berchem received news of this from Samuel Kindt, he went there on the 10th February with building material loaded in the *Groenen Leeuw* for Pulicat. It was thought a good opportunity to make the fort at the same time a little smaller. But the news that a Portuguese fleet was sailing from Goa made them decide to build it speedily in the existing form. The garrison consisted of 75 men and the armament consisted of three metal and eight iron cannon, one metal falcon, eight metal and four iron.

In February, some Portuguese vessels actually came against San Thome. Perhaps the presence of the Dutch vessel *Der Goes* prevented them from undertaking any expedition against the Dutch. They however repeated their attempts to get the Dutch expelled by native governments. The General Djagaradja was back from the war in the interior and the Portuguese requested him twice or thrice to march against Geldria.

The English.

The cruising ships now and then took a Portuguese vessel. It was not long before the English also appeared on the Coromandel Coast. It was very natural that, while so many others came to Pulicat, the English should also appear there. It however gave occasion to Jan Pietersz Coen to write that they came "to pluck our fruits from us". The Dutch were as a matter of fact very friendly to them though Van Berchem relates that an English Captain, when called upon to drink to the health of the Dutch Stadtholder, made very rude remarks.

Messages from Ceylon

In this year the Dutch on Coromandel received messages from Ceylon both from the Maharaja of Kandy and also the Dutch merchant there. The trade with Ceylon was still of little importance, but the

relations with the Maharaja of Kandy were kept up because there was already staying there a merchant who could be considered an envoy. This merchant, Boschouwer, wrote with the Maharaja on the 16th February 1614 letters to Coromandel lamenting that no help was sent against the Portuguese who under Dom Jorge de Saavedra was already spreading their might and building forts. The prince also sent an embassy of 16 persons who came to Tegnapatam with a consignment of precious stones for sale.

Hindrances to Trade.

The development of the trade was meanwhile impeded by two causes (1) the non-supply of sufficient money by the Directors ; (2) the unfitness and naughtiness of the merchants. Van Berchem spoke every moment of the paucity of capital and Coen the Governor-General doubted so little the justice of it that he dared earnestly to reproach the Directors on the 10th November 1614 ending with the words ' that if it continues to be so unprovided for, the whole trade will be ruined (to the brothel and to nothing)'. The Company's interests were injured by their own merchants in two ways, (1) by the large presents given to native rulers. Other European nations did not go to such extreme lengths in the matter of presents ; (2) by private trade. Jan de Labistrate greatly engaged himself in private trade. Anthony Schover, Book-keeper and Senior merchant at Masulipatam, had to account for a shortage of 1,383 pagodas which he said was stolen. He was therefore sent to Bantam on the 16th August 1614 by the *Der Goes*. Even Jan Van Wesick had differences with Van Berchem over some entries and Van Berchem wrote sharply about it. It was thus not for nothing that the visitor Hans de Haze came to Masulipatam to improve the position on 12th November 1616 with the *Roode Leeuw*. The soldiers who had come from the Netherlands with the *Delft* were also sent with the *Roode Leeuw* to Coromandel.

(*b*) THE VISITOR DE HAZE.

Not long before the arrival of De Haze (i.e. in October) the Nayak of Karnataka, Wenketa II, died at Vellore. There was a succession dispute in the Carnatic and De Haze felt that, in the interests of the company, it was best to remain neutral. De Haze, being for the present devoted to retrenchment, reduced the garrison of Geldria to 100 Europeans. He decided also that the walls of the fort should be overlaid with hard stone and chalk so that thereby the great cost of the maintenance of the fort should be reduced. The stones were conveyed from Tirupapuliyur (Tegnapatam). The factory appeared also to cause unnecessary expenditure so that De Haze proposed to

abolish it like Petapoeli. On the 16th January 1615 De Haze got a resolution passed that the Portuguese falling into Dutch hands should be thrown on board and that 4 or 5 principal Portuguese be kept for the redemption of the Dutch prisoners at San Thome.

The *Leeuw* and the *Duyffen* returned with some booty from their cruise and the last named yacht went in May to Arakan.

Delegation to Surat.

De Haze sent the Senior merchant Pieter Gillisz Van Ravesteyn who had already offered himself earlier, but who could not go owing to the continual lack of funds, to Surat to seek and if possible to sell the goods left by Van Deynsen in 1608, about which the Sabandhar of Surat had already written in 1613, and to investigate the circumstances of Van Deynsen's death. Further, Ravensteyn was to institute an exact enquiry into the opportunities of trade and he took with him a letter written in the Portuguese language and addressed to the Mogul Governor and Sabandhar of Surat. An important modification in the government of Coromandel was the transfer of the head from Masulipatam to Pulicat.

Official Changes.

In connection with Wemmer Van Berchem's request to be relieved of his situation, Samuel Kindt was appointed Commander of Geldria and at the same time head and president of Coromandel. This appointment did not meet with the approval of Van Berchem who indicated by a resolution that Kindt, in his opinion, was not suitable because he was sick in his head as a result of a fall from a window. In place of Kindt, Raphael Oliva, Senior merchant of the *Red Lion*, was for three years appointed as Senior merchant of Masulipatam. The instruction of the soldiers was committed to the preacher Harman Barentsz who gave a new bond and was paid 45 guilders a month.

De Haze's Impressions.

De Haze who now got ready to return to Bantam carried with him the conviction that the spirit of the merchants was bad, and that probably none of them was honest. With the accusations and unfavourable judgments of Van Berchem against the merchants, had to be added charges against himself. He had in different ways wasted the rather scarce money of the company and brought them injury. From an Arabian he bought a horse for 300 pagodas and received a white ape as present which made the transaction suspicious.

On the 8th June De Haze sailed on the *Rooden Leeuw* and Van Berchem on the *Der Goes*. Both the ships departed in each other's

company. On the 29th July they saw four Portuguese ships. They were large galleons and, evidently from great distance, they opened fire or they exchanged shots with the Dutch. It was unfortunate for the *Red Lion* which had the lightest guns and sailed slowly, that through the presence of the highest in rank the flag waved from the shipmast, so that the Portuguese seemed to hold on to that ship. This gave occasion to the taking of a decision on board the *Leeuw* whereby the hatred of the great majority of the officers to Van Berchem showed itself. Fearing that, if any mishap befell Corbelis Reyersz, Wemmer Van Berchem might go with the ship *Der Goes* and leave the *Leeuw* with her people in the brine so as to escape all the information and attestation secured by the Visitador on the coast against him, which was kept in the *Leeuw*, they decided that De Haze should move into the *Der Goes* and hoist his flag. It appears that this shameful insinuation on Van Berchem added only to show the hatred of him. De Haze did not sign the resolution but went over to the *Der Goes*.

It is remarkable that Coen who was so strong in other respects was indifferent to the charges against Van Berchem. De Haze did not extend his engagement because of his ignorance of the trade, his haughtiness and bad government. Coen sent him to Holland with the papers brought against him to the Directors remarking 'God knows what is in them, but in effect it is evident that no proper service, and to the company very great shame has been caused'. And De Haze wrote 'How herein is dealt with, let the Lords decide.' Perhaps Van Berchem was a favourite whom they dared not punish. He even went to Netherland as president of a ship, his previous dignity undiminished. The Directors also seem to have taken no action against him, for in the resolutions of 1616 and 1617, nothing was said of the complaints against him.

After the departure of the Visitador Hans de Haze, they proceeded decidedly to improve the fort Geldria. They retained its size, but gave it four bastions of brickwork arming it with 26 pieces of cannon. The bullets with which they were supplied were so bad that they jumped up badly from the guns and caused danger. The cast iron was so bad. Gunpowder was made at the place but this had the peculiarity that it had to be ground for three months. Pulicat had now about 10,000 souls and the European colonists formed 50 households, principally by the marriage of soldiers with native women which was permitted on condition that they should be Christians. With satisfaction Samuel Kindt wrote that the Portuguese towns of San Thome and Negapatam declined. Because the Dutch and the Portuguese plundered on the seas rendering injury to each other's trade, it was important for the Asiatics to have a

safe harbour and therefore it was desirable to have a ship stationed at Pulicat.

CHAPTER X

VAN RAVESTEYN'S OVERLAND JOURNEY TO SURAT.

During the period of the truce with Portugal, the Dutch undertook an overland journey to Surat. Even earlier, there were whispers of Dutch activity in the English letters, as for example, the observation that the Hollanders filled the country with lead in pigs. But after the tragic death of Van Deynsen[1] 'the Dutch were leaving Surat severely alone. It was not that Guzerat clothes were not wanted. They were always needed for the far eastern trade. But, for the time being, they felt that they would purchase from Achin, although at a higher cost, the necessary Guzerat cloth rather than expose themselves to the perils caused by Portuguese influence in the Great Mogul's dominions. The Dutch and the English were alike hateful to the Portuguese and the Jesuits reported to Jahangir that the English and Hollanders were one. They continued equal enemies to both the English and the Dutch.[1]

The Dutch were, as already observed, earlier in India than the English. They were most formidable commercial, political and military competitors. It was in the north-west and in the then important harbour of Surat that the English and the Dutch began their rivalry in India. Of the three nations, the French, the English and the Dutch, the Dutch came first. It appeared for a moment, that to them and not to the English, the future belonged. Next to the fine Coromandel cloth, the rough Guzerat clothes were indispensable for lump sales. The Moluccas, Amboina, Banda, the West Coast of Sumatra and Djambi were favourably situated regions for the Guzerat linen which Jan Pieterszoon Coen also judged were even more necessary than those of Coromandel. Each of the three nations, the Portuguese, the Dutch and the English might at any time be called upon to fight the other two. The Portuguese were important only on the West Coast. The real contest lay between the Dutch and the English.

The tragic story of Van Deynsen[2] was not however destined to close the chapter of Dutch enterprise in Guzerat. On 14/27 November 1609, the Governor-General Both and the Council of India called

[1] Thomas Kerridge at Agra to Thomas Aldworth and Council at Surat in Foster's *English Factories*.

[2] *See* Chapter II.

upon their subordinates at Masulipatam to look into the matter. The Dutch authorities at Masulipatam, on hearing that the native authorities at Burhampur had seized Van Deynsen's effects, threatened to make reprisals on the Mogul shipping. In the words of Hunter, the Dutch, accustomed to barbarian island chiefs, did not realise that they had come under an empire which insisted on good behaviour and could crush the petty infidel settlements by a stroke of the pen. But the Moguls were powerless at sea, and Mogul officers felt the necessity of averting the vengeance on sea of the Dutch who imagined that their countryman had been ill used by the Mogul, and his goods detained. It was the fear of the Dutch reprisals that made the Mogul officers in Surat place themselves in correspondence with the Dutch at Masulipatam on this subject. Already in 1608 the Dutch on the Coromandel had received news from the Sabandar (harbour master) of Surat wherein he offered that he would hand over the goods left behind by Van Deynsen to Dutchmen, competent to receive the same, sent from Coromandel. This remnant of Van Deynsen became in course of time the subject of much dispute. The goods left unowned by the untimely abolition of the Dutch factory at Surat represented decidedly a considerable value, more than 20,000 guilders. In 1613 the Government at Coromandel had reminded themselves of these goods of Van Deynsen. Wemmer Van Berchem entered into correspondence with the sabandar of Surat on this subject. Although this Asiatic who could very well have claimed to have forgotten about this event which took place so far back very willingly gave the information, Van Berchem had the incivility and awkwardness to threaten him with the taking of the Mogul ships as the goods were not rightly acquired. The sabandar answered in the name of the Governor Mukarrab Khan wishing much luck to the best Sir Captain General of the entire Christendom, and showed how improper the threat was as they had rendered a service to the Company by taking the goods in custody. They could go and take them or have, if they wished, the price of the same; they were the friends of the Dutch and wished to remain as such. He further added that Mukarrab was then at war with the Portuguese. If any one could be sent for the goods left behind at Surat or with the Khan Khanan, they would be immediately delivered or paid for. If the Dutch could send one or more ships, as Van Berchem had hinted in his letters, they could be used for taking the Portuguese places of Diu and Daman. Of all the places in the region of Surat, the Dutch were free to choose the best so that they might carry on their trade. Even more alluring was the letter of Mukarrab Khan, Governor of Surat. The letter was meant as a semi-official invitation to the Dutch to send a fleet against

the Portuguese, the offer of the abandoned property being a formality.[1]

This view of the real intention of the Mogul officials is borne out by a letter written by Nicholas Downton from Surat in November 1614 in the course of which he says that the Governor hath sent to Masulipatam for the Hollanders to come hither, and promised them Daman when it is taken from the Portuguese. He alluded to the hostile disposition of Jahangir to the Portuguese which enmity was the best guarantee for the good reception of the Dutch. The Governor found himself in the neighbourhood of the prince and would take advantage of that to secure a favourable reception to the Dutch when they came. The very great kindness with which the Dutch were treated had however still another reason than the noble desire of restoring to them these properties and the desire for their powerful help against the Portuguese. The natives were exposed to the very real peril of their trade being seriously injured by the company. Out of vengeance for the treatment which Van Deynsen had undergone, the Dutch might hinder the voyages of their ships. The Dutch seem to have even threatened that. And the realization of this threat had, for the welfare of the city, to be prevented at any cost. However that be, there appeared in Surat again a favourable chance for attracting the Dutch. It would be worth the trouble involved in sending competent persons from Coromandel on a journey of investigation, if it could be found out how far the Governor and Sabandar could make good their promises. Already in the year 1613 the Senior factor Pieter Gillis Van Ravesteyn had offered to travel overland in the service of the company from Masulipatam to Surat. On the 10th November 1614, Jan Pieterszoon Coen wrote from Bantam to the Directors that an order was sent to Coromandel that, if nothing was done to recover the goods left behind by Van Deynsen, order should be given for that. On the 26th April 1615, it was resolved at Masulipatam that Van Ravesteyn, Senior factor, and Hendrik Adriaensen, assistant on the ship *Der Goes*, should go overland to Surat under the guidance of eight men. On the 5th May 'an instruction' was handed over to them, according to which, they must immediately on arrival try to trace and recover the goods left behind and buy clothes for these goods. If the goods were lost or destroyed, Van Ravesteyn must try to receive indemnification whether in money or merchandise, which goods he must see sent with the Guzeratis to Achin or with the English to Bantam. Letters of recommendation to the most important Muhammadans were given to him so that his negotiations over the goods left behind might be

[1] Moreland: *Akbar to Aurangzebe*, p. 37.

easier. Over the death of Van Deynsen, good information was to be gathered. Van Ravesteyn must try and secure all possible information over the state of Surat and the condition prevailing there. It would be good for the company to know exactly how it was governed, and what trade possibilities there were and how far the influence of the English and the Portuguese stretched. If the impressions of Van Ravesteyn were so favourable that he found it advisable to continue, then he must speedily send information about it to Coromandel with the assistant Hendrik Adriaensen or any others. To the governors and sabandars of Surat, Hans de Haze wrote a Portuguese letter wherein he commended Van Ravesteyn to their kindness as plenipotentiary of the Dutch, besides promising help against the enemies of both, i.e. the Portuguese.

And thus provided with all that was needed for the expedition, Van Ravesteyn departed on the 8th May 1615 on horse on his memorable land journey across India. They could speedily know the truth of the matter. According to the result of this expedition, the Directors should scrap for ever from the company's books the doubtful post of Surat or increase the cargo destined for India proper by the value of 10,000 reals.

The overland journey of Van Ravesteyn from Masulipatam, so full of adventure, would, if it were more widely known than it is at present, surely take a high place among the remarkable achievements of history. Passing by way of Hyderabad and Aurangabad, and after various vicissitudes of fortune, Ravesteyn entered the kingdom of the Great Mogul, and on the 9th June he reached the city of Surat, the goal of his journey. The Dutchmen took their residence in one of the houses of the sabandar situated close to the river Tapti.

Van Ravesteyn's activities in Surat consisted mainly in efforts to secure the goods left behind by Van Deynsen or their value. On the 22nd June Van Ravesteyn sent a letter to Mukarrab Khan, the Governor of Surat, who had invited them mentioning their arrival and soliciting his support. His reply received on the 2nd July was very disappointing. After some compliments, he made it known that his governorship was over. Therefore they could not count on his support. Meanwhile, the situation was becoming more complicated. The Portuguese concluded a treaty with Mukarrab Khan which was confirmed by Jahangir on the 7th June 1615 with the view of keeping the English and Dutch out of India. 'Whereas the English and Dutch under the guise of merchants come to these ports to establish themselves here and make conquests of the land, and whereas their presence in the neighbourhood of India would do a great deal of harm to all, it is now agreed that neither the king Jahangir nor the Viceroy of India shall have any

commercial relations with aforesaid nations, neither shall they give them shelter in their ports nor supply them with provisions.'[1] In July Van Ravesteyn came to know of this peace. On the 18th September, this was confirmed by a firman to the Governor of Surat, wherein it was mentioned that one of the conditions of peace was that the Dutch and English might nowhere have a lodge for their trade. The Sabandar, Kodja Hasan Ali, also told them that the Portuguese were strong here, while the kingdom of Hindustan had no fleet and the Dutch came at most with a single ship. At another time he said that the Dutch and the English were far off, and the Portuguese, who were close by, could do them much harm. Anyhow, the clause in the treaty was a proof of the power which the Portuguese by their fleet could exercise.

On the 14th August there appeared in Surat the new Governor i.e. Zulfikar Khan appointed by the prince Khurram, son of Jahangir. Five days later, he entered the town with great state. Van Ravesteyn applied to him with a piece of velvet and a piece of satin as presents. He showed him the letters of Mukarrab Khan and Godia Assan Alij whereupon the new governor promised to take the side of the Dutch better than his predecessor had done. Also, the Dutch were assured that they need entertain no fears for the Portuguese against whom he would act more vigorously than his predecessor who knew nothing of the art of war. He, Zulikar Khan, was brought up in the war. He showed them his shield, bows and arrows, also a chain and coat of mail and other fittings of a warrior. He further asked for information about the manner of waging war in Holland. The interview, which was friendly enough and lasted two hours, did not bring the Dutch any nearer their aim *i.e.* the recovering of the indebted goods. Of the promised help, nothing came.

The day after his arrival at Surat *i.e.* on the 20th June, Van Ravesteyn waited on the sabandar with whom rested the goods of Van Deynsen. Speedily with their visit to the sabandar, the Dutch perceived that however friendly his attitude, he was less prompt in delivering the goods in question than they might have expected from his letters. After repeated insistence, they received from him on the 28th June some old 'plunderatic' among which were some firelocks and further the sum of 1000 Muhmudis. (1 Mahmudi = ½ guilder). The next day, he sent 30 packs of indigo and some velvet, all in a very bad condition. With this the Sabandar considered himself discharged of his obligation. If they wished to have more, they should go to the Khan Khanan in Berhampur, for, on

[1] Tratados, T. I. : Page 189, quoted on page 25 of Danvers' Report.

the death of Van Deynsen, the then governor of Guzerat had, in the name of the Khan Khanan, detained all Dutch goods. The sabandar was not let off so easily. He had himself admitted having sold a quantity of lead left behind by Van Deynsen. After much higgling, the Sabandar paid 2274 Mahmudis for the lead. This was thought to be very low. Van Ravesteyn did not conceal from the Sabandar his indignation at only a trifle being given him and his being referred to the Khan Khanan for the rest. For such a treatment there was but one explanation possible. The Moors had sent those letters to the Coromandel only by way of compliment. They did not think that the Dutch would eventually undertake the dangerous overland journey. The friendly letters were meant only to protect native shipping from the attacks of the Company. Instead of the complete satisfaction which was hoped for, Van Ravesteyn obtained in Surat finally altogether not more than 16 firelocks, 17 pistols, 6 pieces lamlet, 75 ells valvet, 18 bottles, 8 lbs. sea horse teeth, 30 packs indigo, 600 pieces corneban stones which were partly in a very badly altered state, and some damaged clothing which had been bored by white ants, besides a sum in cash of 3274 or 3275 Mahmudis.

Besides the sabandar and the Governor, the Dutch entered into relations with the Khan Khanan who had seized a considerable portion of Van Deynsen's goods. Two messengers were sent from Surat without any result. Later it was known that three times a reply had been drafted by the Khan Khanan but afterwards they were torn into pieces. Various estimates were given in these letters of the value of Van Deynsen's goods. The first spoke of 2000 Mahmudis,[1] the next 3000, the third of 3314, and the fourth 3750 Mahmudis. This should be paid to the Dutch in Surat. But even this fourth was not signed. It was clear that Van Ravesteyn would obtain nothing from the Khan Khanan if he did not undertake the trouble of going personally to Berhampur. He felt deeply indignant at the small amounts which the above named letters had mentioned. The sabandar had frequently said that goods to the value of 20,000 Mahmudis had been sent to Berhampur. While the negotiations had a slow and unfruitful course, he did not waste the time. He sold the velvet, Kamlet bottles, and sea horse teeth though at less than the normal price. He made also a journey of exploration in the neighbourhood. He left Surat on the 24th August, visited Broach and Cambay, and returned to Surat on the 8th September.

The instructions given by De Haze to Van Ravesteyn at Masulipatam mentioned what goods must be bought in return

[1] Mahmudi was originally equal to $\frac{2}{5}$ of a rupee (Moreland).

for the remnant of Van Deynsen for being taken back with them. All sorts of clothes were desired, for example, the famous baftas and cannekyns. But, of the large purchase of cloth which they at Masulipatam expected, but little could be realized owing to the very small quantity of goods and cash which the sabandar had handed over to Van Ravesteyn. He did his best with his scanty means to buy a great many variety of clothes so that he might send them as samples to Bantam. He made his purchases in Broach and Surat, partly for the fatherland, partly for the Indies.

In the disturbed condition of the country, people were not safe against the attacks of robbers and the greed of customs officers ; so it was thought unsafe to send the recovered and purchased goods overland to Masulipatam. Fortunately, a favourable opportunity for sending goods to Bantam was furnished by the presence of the English Admiral Keeling who was in charge of the vessel which brought the famous ambassador Sir Thomas Roe. Soon after the arrival of the latter, Van Ravesteyn paid him a visit and their mutual relations were of a friendly nature. This furnished the occasion for the Dutch to request Keeling with good confidence to carry the recovered Dutch goods and samples of cloth to Bantam naturally for proper compensation. The commander was not unwilling. First he tried to buy the goods, but when he perceived that such was not the idea of Van Ravesteyn, he agreed to their request. The transit of the goods to Swally did not take place without much difficulty, for they had to ask permission at seven or eight places to ship goods. In the customs house, the goods were assessed at one and a half times their value, so that Van Ravesteyn had to pay 320 Mamudis more than they were liable ; goods were brought to Swally partly in boats and partly on waggons, and were shipped in the English ship the *Dragon*—30 packs of indigo, a pack of clothes and a chest with firelocks and pistols. A letter for Bantam was also given to Keeling. When the Dutch wanted to pay the freight to the English Commander of the fleet, the latter excused it. The transport of the goods, he said, should be a friendly act which they willingly showed to the Dutch. If such an occasion occurred to them, the Dutch should also do the same. And thus the goods were actually delivered by the *Dragon* at Bantam in May 1616. Such friendliness was little appreciated by Jan Pieterszoon Coen, the Governor-General, who feared that, in return for this small convenience, the English would make large claims for the kindness they showed.

The good understanding between the English and the Dutch in Surat enabled Van Ravesteyn to enjoy the advantage of performing his proposed journey to Berhampur in the company of Sir Thomas Roe. And so he left Surat on the 9th November 1615 after having

received, four days before, letters written by the Sabandar, Godia Assan Ali, to the Khan Khanan and other important persons. They reached Berhampur on the 24th November. The same day he went to the court of Khan Khanan where after long waiting he was called in. He handed over to the Khan Khanan the letters of Godi Assan Alij and Mukarrab Khan, besides those of the most important Moors of Masulipatam. After reading the letters the Khan Khanan said that the Dutch were welcome, but said nothing further over the subject of the letters. The principal clerk whom the Dutch called to them said no Dutch goods had come to his master's house, and that the Nabob was not a man who sought other people's goods. The sabandar and others had a consignment of Dutch goods, but one of them had left the place and the other was dead. Thus began the negotiations which threatened to be even more tardy than at Surat. On the 28th November, however, the head clerk declared that the Nabob had in hand 4000 Mamudis of Dutch goods, and that he would speak with his master over that. On the 30th November, Van Ravesteyn, who, owing to indisposition, could take no part in further negotiations, sent Hendrik Adriaensen to the court. The latter learned from the clerk that the Dutch could receive the 4000 Mahmudis in question if they gave a written certificate that they had therewith received complete satisfaction, so that the native ships might not again be attacked by the Company. Hendrik Adriaensen would not however agree to this proposal, but declared that he was prepared to give a receipt for the sum actually received. On the 15th December the party left Berhampur, greatly disappointed.

The return journey to Masulipatam was full of difficulties and of long duration. While the journey from Masulipatam to Surat lasted only 42 days, that of Berhampur to Masulipatam took 56 days. As the straight route was unsafe through the Deccan wars, they went through Ahmedabad. On the 9th February 1616, the Dutch returned to Masulipatam after an absence of nine months.

The land journey had not fulfilled its aim. They had by no means recovered the goods of Van Deynsen or recovered compensation. But besides this, Van Ravesteyn had been charged to gather, as far as possible, information about the condition and conveniences for trade in the regions round Surat. And this trade was properly performed. Diligently was information gathered on all that would be of importance for the trade of the company. The result of his investigation, Van Ravesteyn laid down in a ' remonstrantie ' which should serve as a foundation for consultation whether it was desirable to begin trade anew at Surat. In a letter to the Directors at Amsterdam dated the 16th March 1616 Van Ravesteyn stated that he held it inadvisable to establish a factory in Surat. [5] In the first place the war in the Moluccas had to

be energetically carried on and all available resources of the company should be employed for that purpose. Further, the undertaking was very difficult as the place was in easy reach of the Portuguese, and thirdly a factory could not be established without securing a firman from the Great Mogul, which could be obtained only with very great trouble. Such a charter, Van Ravesteyn felt, must ensure the following points:—(1) Religious freedom. (2) Favourable conditions regarding toll. (3) Goods should not lie in bankshall lest half of them should be stolen. (4) Freedom of trade with whomsoever they liked, unmolested by the governor. (5) Guarantee against the Governor appropriating any portion of the merchandise on the protest that it was for the king's use. (6) Provision of a suitable place as a lodge. (7) Provision of boats and carts to the Dutch for proper payment when they lay at the harbour. (8) Goods should not be sold to the natives on credit, for experience had taught them how much bad debts would swell up. (9) When any Dutchman died, his goods should not be claimed by the king. They did not belong to the king, but to the company. Thus the result[1] of Van Ravesteyn's celebrated overland journey was that, besides an extensive report about the opportunities of trade, he had received some goods estimated at 3048 guilders. Hans De Haze proposed that, as they had been defrauded by the Khan Khanan who must have had 20,000 guilders worth of Dutch goods and yet offered only 4,000 Mahmudis, they should offer violence both for the money and for the death of David Van Deynsen. But Coen thought more mildly over the matter and wrote to the Directors for orders.

APPENDIX No. 1.

[*Heeres :* p. 544, xxxvii c. (TRANSLATION).]

Agreement made by Cornelis Jacobszen Van Breekvelt and Han Bullard, delegates of the Captain Arent Martenszen and Willem Janszen, on behalf of and by the authority of the noble and powerful the Lords States of the United Netherlands and His Princelike Excellency Maurice of Nassau etc. etc. on the one side, and the illustrious high born Kaiser of Malabar, King of Calicut, on the other side.

Firstly :[2] His Princelike Excellency shall have for his subordinates at Calicut a place for constructing a stone house for keeping

[1] Macleod, Vol. I, p. 199.
[2] The contracts Nos. 24 and 26 in *Heere's* and this contract are apparently made on a fixed model.

ammunition of war, gunpowder, bullets, torches, anchors, cables and all other merchandise safe from incendiaries, thieves and other mishaps. Further we, Hollanders, Zeelanders and all others trading for the General Company shall be bound to pay 2 per cent on all goods and merchandise that are landed or loaded here; it being well understood that what has been paid for once shall not again be taxed. Also money, rice, and other necessaries for the house shall not be taxed. The Zamorin shall not have power to permit any Portuguese live or trade at Calicut but on the contrary shall forbid them as our Hollanders are residing there. No man on either side shall have power to raise any dispute or argument on religious questions. If any one is caught in a wrong deed by the Zamorin or in his land, he shall be kept by the Zamorin to be delivered into the hands of our nation. All merchants shall have power to treat with us in buying and selling all merchandise and goods without any one forbidding them. The Zamorin shall not have power to permit any European nation not permitted by His prince-like Excellency to trade here. We also promise on behalf of the General Company to the Zamorin that if he desires to order any goods, artillery, ammunition of war or other rarities from our lands, we shall be bound to bring them at the first opportunity for which the Zamorin shall be bound to pay its cost in our land. We Hollanders and Zeelanders shall also have power to cut wood and fetch water in the Kaiser's land without being forbidden by the Kaiser or any one else. All which, we agree on behalf of the General Company, never more to break as truly as God Almighty must help us.

(*Note.*—This document is not dated and perhaps was only a draft.)

APPENDIX No. 2.

Dutch Activities at Masulipatam, 1615–16

Letter of Lucas and Antheunis of Masulipatam to Sir Thomas Roe, dated the 1st and 15th February mentions the following facts:—

There arrived out of Holland a ship named the *Whitebear* which brought 40,000 reals in money. In the company of two or three pinnaces and frigates, which they manned out of the fort of Pulicat, where they always kept above 80 soldiers, the ship sailed 'under Ceylon' to welcome their 'friends' (ironical!) the Portuguese who came from Bengal, Tennasserim and other places. The English writer was satisfied that the Dutch were resolved to send the ship back to Holland; having provision there of about 600 farthells

of white yarn, of percalles, moores, Sallempories and other white cloth and shashes (turban cloth) for Barbary, 16 covatts long, 100 fathels, of indigo of diverse sorts and 1,000 chuls; provided with these and with what they could purchase more, the Dutch had the means to send the ships to Holland. The Dutch purchases adversely affected the English who had come late. Says Antheunis 'I fear I shall get but small quantity this year, the time being so far passed by coming too late and the best bought up by the Dutch'. The Dutch had great capital employed both at Masulipatam and Petapoeli.

The Dutch had always to fear the attacks of the Portuguese. 'Here is certain news' says Lucas Antheunis 'sent from Pulicat four Dutch miles from San Thome where the Dutch have a fort furnished with 130 or 140 soldiers, that the Portugal arm themselves as well in San Thome as Negapatam with 1,500 or 2,000 soldiers for a certain exploit. It is much feared their designs aim at the Dutch fort named Geldria.'

The resolutions of the English ships in Singapore, dated the 14th January 1615 and signed by Lucas Anthoneus and five others throw much light on the nature of the Dutch activities at Masulipatam. The Dutch it is stated had purchased up in the country reasonable quantities of indigo and at very cheap rates. The English were always anxious lest the Dutch should engross the whole trade, and were devising means that the Dutch might in no way exceed or circumvent their proceedings.

APPENDIX No. 3.

Treaty with the Nayak of Karnataka

(*Heeres: Corpus Diplomaticum Neerlando Indicum, Pages 100–104*)

(Translation)

Agreement and contract made by the Director Wember Van Bergen on behalf of the Honourable the abovementioned States General and His Princelike Excellency Maurice of Nassau, etc. and on the authority of the honourable Pieter Both, Governor-General over the Dutch Indies on the one side and the illustrious High Born King named Vencata Pathi Raija Lou king of the lands Carnatijca, Sinruasina Patij and many other noble lords on the other side and that for eternal and unbreakable—this 12th of December, A.D. 1612 in Vellore.

As the Portuguese of San Thome on the 9th January this year have rased the head factory at Pulicat described above and plundered the company's goods, killed some of the people and took

with them to San Thome as prisoners the Senior merchant Adolff Thomaszoon and the rest, it has become necessary to enter into a fresh agreement with the abovenamed king as follows :—

Firstly the king shall permit the queen named Obayama to build at her own cost the fortress begun at the abovenamed Pulicat, and make it completed and keep it with her people. She shall be bound to hand over every evening the keys of the gate into our hands so that the same may be handed over in the morning to the porter placed there besides our people whom we shall set to open the above said gates and to close in the evening. Further we shall have to our use the half of the abovenamed fort. There His Princelike Excellency shall have power according to his pleasure to have a stone house for protecting all ammunition of war, gun powder, lead, bullet, londt (?), anchors, ropes, sails and all other merchandise from fire, rovers, thieves and such other misfortunes.

Further, the king promises to the Director abovenamed to cause to be delivered in our hands, our people taken prisoners at Pulicat by the Portuguese in his lands, and besides that to get our goods taken by the Portuguese restored.

Further shall we, Hollanders and Zeelanders and all who do business here on behalf of the General Company be bound to pay for all the goods and merchandise which shall be alighted here 1½ per cent. and that loaded here 2 per cent well understanding that what once is paid for shall not be taxed again. Also money, rice and other necessaries for the house shall not be taxed.

The king shall not permit any Portuguese to dwell or trade in Palleacatta, but on the contrary forbid them.

Nobody on either side shall be allowed to raise any question, argument or dispute about religion.

If anybody does any harm to them with the king or in his land, the king shall be bound to hand them to the hands of our nation.

Further all persons and merchants shall be permitted to trade with us, buy and sell all merchandise and goods without anybody being forbidden.

All dyers and weavers who shall enter into any obligation with the Director or Captain here of dyeing any clothes or delivering any ducks shall be compelled to fulfil them, and in case of default the Captain who is living here shall have power to attack and place them in shackles, and the king shall be bound to expedite the matter and make them act according to their engagements.

Also the king shall not have power to permit any European nation that does not bring the papers from His Princelike Excellency to trade here.

Also we promise on behalf of the General Company to offer to the king any goods, guns, ammunition of war or other toys desired from our lands. We shall be bound to bring them at the first opportunity and for this the king shall be bound to pay according to what it has cost in our lands.

Also shall we have power, on the roads of Palliacatta, San Thome and all other harbours and places of the abovenamed king to damage, attack, and make use of all hostilities on the Portuguese ships and goods without the least contradiction or any impediment or loss being done to us. Regarding the truce made by the king of Spain with the above mentioned, the Right Worshipful States and His Princelike Excellency, the abovenamed Portuguese and Spaniards did not follow the agreement but on the contrary are the violators and breakers of the truce.

All the ships that sailed from here to other places shall sail with passport of the Director or the Captain and our nation shall not have the power to do any harm.

And as the above written Palliacatta is situated far from the king, we hereby promise that we shall besides be under the protection of Jageragie who shall protect us in all difficulties and accidental occurrences against all evilly disposed persons or enemies who with violence or artifices wished to hinder us regarding which the above said Jageragie shall give us his kaul for our security and tranquillity.

All which above written contract I Venkata Pathi Raje Alou, king of the lands of Carnatica, Sinruassijna, Patij and more other principalities (? Manors) promise never more to break. This I swear by my god Perumal. I Wember Van Bergen, Director and contracting party on behalf of the General East India Company, promise never more to break it.

APPENDIX No. 4.

Explanation of Technical Terms.

Bafta = Calico of rather better texture than dhoti. (Moreland, p. 55).
Katila = Coasting fleets. (Moreland, p. 35).
1 *Last (of rice)* = 3,270 ℔ avoirdupois.
Sampan = A kind of small boat or skiff (Hobson Jobson).
Pecul = 133⅓ ℔. avoir.
Bahar = 3 peculs or 400 ℔. avoir.
1 *Candy* = 500 ℔.
1 *Last (measurement)* = 120 cu. ft.
1 *Guilder* = 5/6 of a rupee.
1 *Mahmudi* = 2/5 of a rupee.
1 *Rial of Eight* = two rupees.

REVIEWS

SELECTIONS FROM THE PESHWA DAFTAR. 21. BALAJIRAO PESHWA AND EVENTS IN THE NORTH 1741-1761. Editor—Mr. G. S. Sardesai, B.A., Government Central Press, Bombay, 1932. Price Rs. 3-8 or 6s. ($9\frac{1}{2} \times 6$, 3, 221 pp.)

Mr. Sardesai, the indefatigable editor of the *Peshwa Daftar*, continues to do his useful work, and the volume before us embodies a selection of letters bearing on the eventful reign of Balajirao Peshwa and the Maratha enterprises in the north from 1741-1761 A. D. These extracts are in the original Marathi with brief summaries in English, so brief that they often seem to fall short of their purpose, which is obviously to convey to the readers, ignorant of the Marathi language, the meaning of the original.

It is remarkable that the new materials here presented go to confirm in many important details the narratives of the classical writers on Maratha history like Grant Duff. In particular they throw welcome light on the battle of Panipat and enable us to say at length with tolerable certainty that the Maratha reverses were due no less to the mutual jealousy and the irreconcilable differences between Holkar and Sindia, the two ablest generals of the Peshwa, than to the superior prowess and the organising skill of the enemy. A letter of 1746 gives us a clue to the beginning of the dispute between these two generals, while that of 1760 provides indisputable evidence of the hatred they bore each other, which made Malharrao Holkar not to march to Sindia's assistance, when the latter was hard pressed by the combined forces of the Abdali and the Rohillas (Nos. 15 and 177).

The letters published in this volume are also important from the point of view of the general history of India inasmuch as they afford excellent glimpses of the condition of the country during this period. It is appalling to find Rajputana, the land of heroes, torn into a thousand rival factions, 'a veritable field of battle between crows and kites.' A news letter of 17th July, 1754 shows by implication

the decline and the impending doom of the Mughal Empire, and the Emperor reduced to the position of a mere puppet in the hands of the Marathas. (No. 60).

From 1756 onwards the gaze of the spectator is concentrated on Ahmedshah Abdali and his Pathan hordes, and one witnesses repeated invasions of a predatory nature from the north-west frontier. The North Indian powers, sick at heart of the supremacy of the overbearing Marathas, make common cause with the invader. A letter dated 14th March, 1760 speaks of the Maratha helplessness and their abandonment of the traditional guerilla tactics, as they find the Abdali a past-master in this kind of warfare (No. 188). 'Only a well-trained army', says the writer of this letter, 'equipped with powerful artillery can hope to succeed against this enemy'.

The volume is handsomely got-up and the work of editing but for the defect pointed out above, appears to be well executed.

G. M. MORAES.

THE WORLD ECONOMIC SURVEY 1931-31. Published by the League of Nations, 1932. George Allen and Unwin. 6s.

In September 1930 the Assembly of the League of Nations, anticipating that the economic slump would not be of short duration, authorized the preparation by the League of Nations Economic Intelligence Service of a 'World Economic Survey'. The first issue of this survey, which deals mainly with the last three years, but also contains a summary of the economic developments since the war, has just been published and will undoubtedly be the most important preparatory volume for the forthcoming World Economic Conference.

In the preliminary summary special emphasis is laid on various factors, such as the development of scientific and technical progress and the opening of the Panama Canal in 1913, which would have faced the world with difficult economic problems even had there been no war to complicate them. There is, for instance, the obvious tendency towards the stabilization of the population of Western Europe and the rapid increase of population in areas—especially in Eastern Europe—

where the utilisation of agricultural and mineral resources has hitherto been backward. This has led, especially since the war, to 'a marked shift of industry' from former industrial areas in Western Europe towards the markets themselves. The change has been rendered all the more possible by the fact that industry is no longer so dependent upon proximity to coal supplies—a feature, of course, which greatly affects people in this country. 'The world production of coal remains at about the same level as before the war; but the production of other sources of power has increased greatly'. More than three and a half times as much petroleum was produced in 1930 as in 1913. In summing up the shift of industry the author points out that the population of several counties around London has increased by some 20 to 30 per cent though the average for Great Britain as a whole is less than 6 per cent.

Great importance is attached to the obstacles now placed in the way of emigration, which was declining before the war but which, for political purposes, has now come almost to a standstill. Presumably it is partly responsible for the increase, already referred to, of the peasant populations in Eastern Europe. In the present depression Australia and New Zealand 'have registered actual losses of population by net emigration'. 'It is clear that migration restrictions should be included among the many ways in which, in the post-war period, almost all governments have interfered with the free play of economic forces.

This weighty work has been prepared by Mr. J. B. Condliffe, formerly Professor of Economics at Canterbury College, New Zealand, and later, at the University of Michigan, U.S.A. Besides giving a detailed account of the economic crisis and the consequent destruction of finance, banking and labour conditions, the book ends with a review of the various proposals, national and international, for the solution of our present economic difficulties, and in the final paragraph 'a note of cautious optimism is sounded'.

The chief value of the *Survey* is that it provides in a single brief and readable volume a bird's-eye view of economic developments in the world as a whole. Illustrations are drawn from different countries or groups of countries, but the description throughout is of world problems and world tendencies.

The *Survey* is illustrated by a considerable number of maps and diagrams including a series of maps showing the growth of the world's population, and an elaborate diagram illustrating the course of the depression quarter by quarter in 35 different countries. While statistics are sparingly used merely to illustrate the argument, the *Survey* contains a great many considered statistical estimates not available elsewhere.

P. J. T.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

League of Nations—Weekly Bulletin.
Calcutta Review.
Dacca University Journal.
Bombay University Journal, No. 1.
Madras Agricultural Journal.
Journal of Indian History.
National College Magazine, Trichur.
St. Thomas' College Magazine, Trichur.
Kottayam College Annual.

Supplement to the Madras University Journal

THE SAMKHYA KARIKA

Studied in The Light of Its Chinese Version

II

BY

M. TAKAKUSU, M.A., Dr. Ph.,

Correspondent of the Ecole Française d'Extreme Orient

Treatise on the "GOḶDEN SEVENTY"
(Suvarṇasaptati)

Treatise on the SĀṀKHYA PHILOSOPHY
(Sāṁkhyaśāstra)

TRANSLATED BY

PARAMĀRTHA,

Master of the Tripiṭaka, Native of India,
Of the Chinese dynasty of Tchen.

(First translated from the French into English, 1931)

MADRAS

PRINTED AT THE DIOCESAN PRESS, VEPERY

1932

PREFACE

The identity of the Sanskrit commentary on the Sāṁkhya, which Paramārtha translated into Chinese, has long been exercising the minds of Oriental scholars. M. Takakusu who translated the Chinese into French in 1904 was of the view that Gauḍapāda's bhāṣya was possibly the original, and worked out the parallelisms in some detail. When, however, the *Māṭharavṛtti* was discovered, it was found to present even greater resemblances and the view that Māṭhara's work was translated by Paramārtha was stoutly maintained by Dr. S. K. Belvalkar. A further study of the two, however, presented rather important differences of doctrine, which have been set forth by the present writer in an article on *Māṭhara and Paramārtha* (Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, July 1931). It was felt both by the present writer and a colleague of his—the Senior Lecturer in the Department of Sanskrit—that more positive results could be reached, if Paramārtha's version were made more accessible to Indian scholars, the majority of whom know neither French nor Chinese. To this end, it was decided to attempt a translation into English and a re-rendering into Sanskrit therefrom. To make the latter as faithful as possible, the rendering from the French has been made almost painfully literal. It is hoped that the reader will understand the need and tolerate the language. M. Takakusu's Introduction has not been translated, since it will not be of particular value for the need we have in mind. Further, that is mainly taken up with the parallelism to Gauḍapāda and the identification of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with Vindhyāvāsin. The former is now of merely antiquarian interest, while the latter is still far from proven. In any case, it is likely to appeal to far fewer scholars than the text of Paramārtha's version.

It has not been thought necessary to translate all of M. Takakusu's footnotes. Those which are purely textual and are not intelligible to those ignorant of the Chinese language and script, have been left out; those textual notes which are intelligible have been translated, dots taking the place of words in Chinese script; the bulk of the notes, however, are both intelligible and easy to render; they have been translated, with here and there a note from the present translator, to give supplementary information, or to indicate some obvious error on the part of M. Takakusu. The present translator's notes are always enclosed in rectangular brackets.

In giving the Sanskrit Kārikās, M. Takakusu follows Gauḍapāda's reading; they do not always correspond to the translation; they have, therefore, been left out, except in some cases, where the French

translator has a note. Mr. T. R. Chintamani, when he has finished his work of re-rendering into Sanskrit, will no doubt have something to say on the correspondence of the Sanskrit Kārikās to Paramārtha's rendering.

The translator takes the opportunity of expressing his grateful thanks to the Editor of the *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extreme Orient*, and to M. Takakusu, for the kind permission to translate the work.

S. S. SURYANARAYANAN.

LIMBDI GARDENS,
October 8, 1931.

THE SUVARṆASAPTATI

I. By reason of the torment (caused by)[1] *the three sorts of misery, the inquiry [research] into the means of destroying them (is necessary). Since the means are manifest, one will say, (this inquiry) is without object. No, since they are neither definite nor final [definitive].*[2]

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

I explain here the origin of this verse. There was formerly a wise ascetic called Kapila, born of heaven, innately endowed with the qualities : law (= virtue), knowledge, impassivity, existence by himself, these four qualities together constituting his self. Seeing humanity plunged in blind darkness, he experienced for it a great compassion. 'Alas! they live and die in blind darkness.' Thinking thus, he looked round the world, and discovered Āsuri, brāhmin by birth, who had sacrificed to heaven regularly for a thousand years. Disguising himself, he approached the brāhmin, and addressed to him these words : 'O Āsuri, thou amusest thyself with leading the life of a master of a house [gṛhastha]'. Having spoken, he withdrew without receiving any reply. After another thousand years, he returned and repeated the same words. On hearing them, the brāhmin replied : 'O, honoured of the world, indeed I enjoy the life of the master of a house'. The ascetic heard him and went back from him in silence. Some time after, he returned, repeating the same words, and received the same reply. Kapila asked : 'Canst thou maintain thyself pure, and live the life of a brahmacārin ?' 'I can', replied Āsuri. Thenceforward he renounced the way of his family and commenced the ascetic observances, as a disciple of Kapila.

[1] The words placed within brackets are supplied by me to show clearly what the translator has wished to say. The parts which coincide with the explanations of Gauḍapāda have been indicated in the Introduction [not translated here ; See *BFEO*, IV, pp. 1-65, more particularly, pp. 5-24], to which it will suffice to refer.

[2] This verse is rendered into Chinese as literally as possible. Jijñāsā, 'research', as in the Chinese . . . . 'desire to know', is employed as a noun, even as one sees from the commentary. 'Means' is in Chinese 'causes,' employed in the same sense. One may, at first sight, find my translation a little forced, but we cannot translate otherwise, if we read with care the commentary, the Chinese original of which is omitted here, for want of space.

One may ask[1] : 'With what end is the brāhmin's investigation made ?' The reply is : *by reason of the torment* (*caused by*) *the three sorts of miseries.* What are these three ? That which comes from *within*, that which comes from *without*, that which is caused by *the heavens.* (The internal misery is of two kinds, *physical* and *mental*).

The internal first : In consequence of disorders caused by the wind, the heat or the phlegm one may have a malady. In the book of medicine it is said : 'the part of the body below the navel is called the seat of wind, that below the heart is called the seat of heat, and all that is above the heart belongs to phlegm. It happens sometimes that the wind element increases and presses [against] the heat and the phlegm ; then is produced a misery caused by the wind. The misery caused by the heat or by the phlegm is produced in the same manner'. One calls these miseries *physical* miseries. The mental miseries are separation from what one loves, contact with what one hates, and non-success in one's enterprises. In realising these three, one experiences a misery in the mind. All the foregoing miseries are internal.

External miseries : miseries produced by men, birds, beasts, venomous serpents, landslips, the breach of a dam, etc., are called *external.*

Third kind of miseries : those caused by *the heavens.* All the sufferings and failures occasioned by celestial phenomena such as cold, heat, wind, rain, thunder and lightning are called miseries caused by the heavens.

Because (we) are tormented by these three sorts of miseries we commence the investigation which ought to serve as a means to destroy these miseries.

One may say : 'The means capable of destroying the three miseries are sufficiently known. First, that which is treated in the eighth section of medical science[2] is capable of destroying the miseries of the body. Secondly, the six objects of sense,[3] wherein one finds pleasure, are capable of curing the miseries of the soul. When these means (of cure) are already so known, why an extra investigation ?' The reply is: 'Your opinion is not admissible. Since (the ordinary means) imply two defects, a (philosophical)

[1] '*One may ask*' is in Chinese '*a profane person says*', the questioner being called 'a profane person' throughout the work.

[2] The eight divisions of medicine are given by Yi-tsing, whose enumeration accords with the eight sections of the Āyurveda. See my *I-tsing's Record*, p. 222.

[3] The six objects of sense are: form, sound, odour, taste, touch and all these objects combined. The last category is otherwise called *dharma*, 'law', by the Buddhists, being the object of the *manas*. These are the six *guṇas* of the *Garbha-Upaniṣad*.

investigation is not against (that is to say, without) reason. What are these two defects ? It is that the means are not definite, certain and that they are not final '.

One may say: 'If the eight sections of medical science, etc., imply the two defects and consequently are insufficient as means of destroying the miseries, we have other means taught in the four Vedas, and as these means are fruitful, being certain and final, your investigation is superfluous. It is said in the Vedas: "Of old we have drunk the soma; that is why we have become immortal, and have obtained entry to the resplendent heaven, where I see and know all the divinities. What can misery or enmity avail against me ? How can death touch me ?" '[1] To that one replies :

II. Similar to the obvious (means) are the revealed (means) which are accompanied by impurity, loss, superiority or inferiority. Another means, different from these two is excellent, because of the knowledge of the evolved (principle), the non-evolved (principle) and the Spirit (of the Self).

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

The obvious means are those of which medical science treats. They imply two defects, that is to say, they are neither definite nor final. What we call the revealed means, they are those which one obtains by tradition. They have been taught at the beginning by Brahmā and transmitted to the wise ascetic (the ṛṣi Kapila). One calls them then the revealed means, understanding thereby the four Vedas. The Vedas themselves imply then the two defects, like the medical science [which is an] obvious [means]. Besides that they have three other defects :

(1) They are *impure*. It is said in the Veda: 'O thou animal! thy father, thy mother and thy kindred all approve of thee. Now thou art about to abandon thy present body to be re-born in the

[1] *Ṛgveda*, VIII, 4, 8, 3 :
apāma somam amṛtā abhūmāganma jyotir avidāma devān!
kiṃ nūnam asmān kṛṇavad arātiḥ kimu dhūrtir amṛta martyasya ||
Gauḍapāda gives this verse under v. II. (One does not find in the Chinese text any verse corresponding to the two maṅgala verses of Gauḍapāda : ' Kapilāya namaḥ ' etc.—The verse recalling the seven sages of the School, given by Gauḍapāda, is not found in the Chinese ; but cf. the commentary on vv. XLIII and LXXI, *infra*.—The verse ' pañcaviṃśatitattvajño ' etc., of Gauḍapāda is given under vv. II and XXXVII, *infra*. In comparing the text of Gauḍapāda with the Chinese, it is necessary to combine vv. I and II. Gauḍapāda seems to have re-modelled the materials he had before him, in changing the order of the original commentary, which is represented by the Chinese).

heavens '.[1] 'According to the prescriptions of the horse-sacrifice, six hundred animals less three (equal to 597) are killed '.[2] If the number is incomplete, the sacrificer cannot obtain birth in heaven, nor the enjoyment of the five sorts of acts, that is to say, the act of amusing one-self, etc.[3] For the case where some one utters a falsehood, some devas or ṛṣis declare in the Vedas that that does not imply a crime. Such faults (killing, lying, etc.) are found in the Vedas : consequently the Vedas themselves are not pure.

(2) They imply *decay* or *loss*. It is said in the Vedas : 'Without reason, Śakra, Indra and the God Asura are extinguished, because of their age, for one does not escape time'.[4] The conditions of [that] life exhausted, the sacrificer will be removed from the heavens. Thus (the remedies according to the Vedas) imply decay and loss.

(3) They are subject to *superiority* and to *inferiority*. Just as, in seeing the rich, the poor and the needy envy them, just as the ugly one is jealous of the beautiful, and the ignorant person of the wise one, even so it is in the heavens : those of the inferior grade look on those of the superior grade with a sentiment of envy. Even thus there is superiority in one and inferiority in the other.

The three defects with the two mentioned higer up, render the Vedas inefficacious as a means (to the destruction of misery). One will say : 'If it is thus, what means is excellent ?' The reply is, '*Opposed to these two means, the Vedic means and the ordinary means. there is an excellent means.*' Neglecting the two others, one ought to search for an efficacious remedy. The means that one proposes here (that is to say, philosophical investigation) has five excellent points. It is (1) definite, (2) final, (3) pure, (4) permanent, (5) universal: For these reasons it is superior to the two above-mentioned.

[1] Cf. *Ṛgveda*, I, 163, 13. This passage is often cited in Buddhist works in Chinese. In the commentary to the *Śataśāstra*, it is said : 'At the commencement of creation, he who is born with a good spirit and with good elements will have a place in the eternal heaven. But he who is endowed with less good spirit and elements is born in the world, where he will seek to be re-born in heaven. To that end, he will offer a horse-sacrifice (*aśvamedha*). A white horse is let loose in the fields for a hundred days, sometimes for three years Wherever the horse may go, the sacrificer will follow it and will distribute gold to all. Then the horse is caught and killed. At the moment of killing it, one pronounces this formula : "O Paśu (animal) ! We kill thee". A sacrificed horse can thus be re-born in heaven'. Paramārtha, the translator, adds that the law of the horse-sacrifice is found in the four Vedas, that in the *Pāramitaśāstṛa* the sixty-four good qualities (of the horse) are enumerated, and that one of them is the sacrifice of the horse to heaven [?].

[2] Gauḍapāda reproduces the same passage :
ṣaṭ śatāni niyuḥjyante paśūnām madhyame 'hani |
aśvamedhasya vacanād ūnāni paśubhis tribhiḥ ||
I do not find this verse in the Veda.

[3] That is to say, the acts of the five *karma-indriyāṇi*.

[4] The verse of Gauḍapāda is a little different :
bahūnīndrasahasrāṇi devānām ca yuge yuge |
kālena samṛtītāni kālo hi duratikramaḥ ||

One may ask: 'How can one obtain this means?' Here is the reply: '*By the knowledge of the evolved, the non-evolved, and the Spirit (of the Self).*' The evolved comprises: (1) the 'Great' (*Mahat*, that is to say, the Intellect); (2) The Sentiment of self (*ahaṁkāra*); (3) the five subtle elements (*tanmātrāṇi*); (4) the five organs of sense (*jñāna-indriyāṇi*); (5) the five organs of action (*karma-indriyāṇi*); (6) the mind (*manas*); (7) the five gross elements (*mahābhūtāni*). These seven have been created by Nature (*prakṛti*). Nature has not been produced, because she is the original (productive) cause. The Spirit (*ātman*) is the knower (the subject). 'He who knows the twenty-five (principles), wherever he may be found, by whatever path he may go, whether he have tresses of hair, or whether he have only a tuft, or whether he have a shaven head, that one is released, without any doubt.'[1]

One may ask: 'How can we distinguish Nature, the produced principles and the knowing subject?' In reply to that it is said:

III. Primal Nature is not a product.[2] *Mahat etc. are either producers or products. The sixteen are products alone; the knowing subject (the Spirit) is neither a producer nor a product.*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

Primal Nature produces all that exists without herself being produced by another object. That is why one calls her 'Nature, the producer (*mūla-prakṛti*).' In other words, Nature produces Mahat and the others; that is why one has given her the name of 'root (*mūla*).' Not being produced by another object, she is not a product.

Mahat, the Sentiment of self (*ahaṁkāra*), and the five subtle elements (*pañca tanmātrāṇi*), these seven are either producers or products. (For) Mahat is produced by Nature, it is then a product; it produces the Sentiment of self, it is then a producer. The Sentiment of self comes from Mahat, it is then a product; as it produces the five subtle elements, it is also a producer. The five subtle elements come from the Sentiment of self, they are then products but they produce the five gross elements (*mahābhūtāni*) and the organs of sense (*indriyāṇi*), they are then productive; that is to say,

[1] . . . . This verse recurs under v. XXXVII, where, however, the last hemistich differs a little . . . . 'equally to obtain Deliverance'. Alberuni (I, 133) attributes a similar verse to Vyāsa.

[2] What I translate as 'product' is in Chinese . . . . 'mutation' (*vikṛti*). The commentary explains it throughout by 'product'.

the subtle element of sound produces ethereal space and the organ of hearing, the subtle element of odour produces the earth and the organ of smell, and so on. These seven then are either productive or produced.

'*The sixteen are products alone.*' The five gross elements, ether, air, etc. ; the five organs of sense, ears, eyes, etc. ; the five organs of action, speech, hands, etc. ; and the mind, these are the 'sixteen' which are neither produced by others nor are productive ; it is then said that they are products alone.

'*The knowing subject* (*the Spirit*) *is neither a producer nor a product.*' By the knowing subject one understands the self endowed with a knowing activity. The Spirit is neither a producer nor a product. Different from the three preceding (Nature, the seven and the sixteen), it is neither a producer nor a product.

One may ask : 'By what sort of inference can you establish the three categories ? For, in the world, one can know (all) by inference, even as with a balance or a measure we know the weight or the length.' Here is the reply :

IV. By perception, by comparison and by sacred authority, we are capable of knowing all the objects (*of the discussion*). *There are then three sorts of proofs. It is by the proof that an object* (*of the discussion*) *is established with success.*

SANSKRIT KĀKIKĀ.

Commentary.

In this doctrine [system], the proof is of three sorts :

(1) Proof by *perception.* The knowledge (of that which ought to be proved) is obtained by the organs of sense and the objects of sense. It cannot be demonstrated (by inference) ; (however), it is uncertain and of a double [deceitful ?] character. Such is the proof by perception.

(2) Proof by *comparison.* This proof presupposes the proof by perception, and it is of three sorts : (*a*) inference from what precedes (*pūrvavat*, i.e. with the cause), (*b*) inference from what follows (*śeṣavat*, i.e., with the effect), (*c*) inference by analogy (*sāmānyataḥ*).

(3) Proof by *sacred authority.* If an object cannot be known by the proofs of perception or comparison, we refer ourselves to a sacred authority, and the proof will be made. Thus, the regions like Heaven or Uttarakuru can be known neither by perception nor by inference. We can know them only by referring ourselves to a sacred authority. As for sacred authority, it is said: 'Āgama (tradition) is sacred authority ; a saintly person is free from all error,

and, being free from all error, he never utters a lie, by reason of the absence of cause.'[1]

'*We are capable of knowing all the objects* (*of the discussion*).' Even if there were a different method of proof or a different object (of the discussion), they would not be excluded from these three. The six methods of demonstration, that is to say, comparison (upamāna) and the others,[2] are included in sacred authority.

'*It is by proof that an object* (*of the discussion*) *is established with success*'. The objects (of the discussion) are the twenty-five categories, which comprehend all that exist. '*Established with success*' means that the twenty-five (*tattvas*) are clearly known. How can they be called the objects (of the discussion)? Because *it is on their account that there is knowledge or proof. Therefrom results the stablishment of an object* (*of the discussion*). By evidence [of the senses], by comparison [inference], and by authority we can establish the three categories (*vyakta, avyakta, jña*), in brief, and the twenty-five in full.

Some one will ask: 'You say that proof is three-fold; What are the characteristics of the three-fold proof?' Here is what is said in reply:

V. Proof by perception is the knowledge which we obtain in the face of an object of sense. Proof by comparison (*inference*) *is known to be of three sorts; it supposes a characteristic mark* (*predicate*) *and that which bears that mark* (*subject*). *The teaching of a saintly person is called sacred authority.*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Proof by perception*, etc.' The ear obtains knowledge by sound . . . . and the nose by odour. It is only a perception (which the organ obtains), but not a judgment by comparison (inference). That is what is called *proof by perception.*

'*Proof by comparison is known to be of three sorts.*' (1) Starting from what precedes (antecedent, *a priori, pūrvavat*, 'with the cause'). (2) Starting with what remains (subsequent, *a posteriori, śeṣavat*, 'with the effect'). (3) By analogy (generic, *sāmānyataḥ*). The triple knowledge is obtained by perception, and it is capable of

[1] Gauḍapāda gives that verse thus:
āgamo hy āptavacanam āptam doṣakṣayād viduḥ |
kṣīṇadoṣo 'nṛtam vākyam na brūyād dhetvasambhavāt ||

[2] Here is a reference probably to Jaimini's six kinds of proof, but the details, which Gauḍapāda gives are not found in the Chinese. The six *pramāṇas* of Jaimini are:
(1) arthāpatti, 'presumption'; (4) pratibhā, 'comprehension';
(2) sambhava, 'proportion'; (5) aitihya, 'communication';
(3) abhāva, 'privation'; (6) upamāna, 'comparison'.

distinguishing the three cases (cause, effect, and similarity), and the three times (past, present and future). That is what is called the *three-fold inference.* For example, men see black clouds and infer that it is about to rain (*pūrvavat*); or else, seeing the water of a river recently muddled, they know that rain has fallen higher up the river (*śeṣavat*); or else, they see the mangoes flower at Pāṭaliputra and infer from it that in Kośala too, they are in flower (*sāmānyataḥ*).[1]

'*It implies a characteristic mark* (*predicate*) *and that which bears that mark* (*subject*).' The mark and that which bears the mark are found united and are not separated one from the other. When one perceives the mark, the proof can be established by inference.[2]

'*The teaching of a saintly person*', etc. For example, the four Vedas given out by the god Brahmā, and the Dharmaśāstra of the king Manu.

Some one may ask: 'You say that there is a three-fold proof by inference. What is the domain of each method of proof?' The reply is:—

VI. It is in reasoning by comparison, analogy, etc., that an object beyond the domain of the senses can be demonstrated.[3] *If it is difficult to attain by reasoning, it becomes manifest, when one follows sacred authority.*[4]

[1] The *pūrvavat* inference is an inference of the effect through the cause, *a priori*: It is the means of knowing the future through the present. The *śeṣavat* inference is the inference of the cause through the effect: it is the means of knowing the past through the present. The *sāmānyataḥ* inference is the inference by analogy, based simply on generic properties: it is the means of knowing the present through the present. The examples given in the Chinese text seem to be better adapted to the purpose than those of Gauḍapāda, who has employed other examples in the second case and in the third. The second example of the Chinese agrees with that of the *Nyāya-sūtra-vṛtti*:
Pūrvam kāranam, tadvat tallingakam, yathā meghounati-viśeṣeṇa vṛṣṭyanumānam | śesaḥ kāryam, tallingakam śesavat, yathā nadivṛddhyā vṛṣṭyanumānam | sāmānyato dṛṣṭam, kāryakāraṇabhinnaliṅgakam, yathā pṛthivitvena dravyatvānumānam ||
'Antecedent, that is to say, cause; characterised by that or having that (cause); e.g., from the accumulation of clouds to infer rain. Subsequent, that is to say, effect; characterised by that; e.g., from the rising of the river to infer rain. Analogous (or generic); characterised as distinct at the same time from cause and effect; e.g., from the fact that something is earthy, to infer that it is a substance'. See Wilson, note to v. V of the *Sāṁkhya-Kārikā-Bhāṣya*.

[2] Fujii, the Japanese commentator, using a well-known comparison, says in this place: 'The sign, it is the smoke (the object of preception), and the possessor of the sign, it is the fire (the subject of the inference). Seeing the smoke we infer: there is a fire in the forest'. *Cf.* Garbe, *Mondschein*, p. 447, note 4.
[It is difficult to see why M. Takakusu interprets *mark* as *predicate*, which would mean *probandum*, not *probans*, as obviously intended by the verse and its commentators.]

[3] Word for word: 'can be established'.

[4] Paramārtha has construed the text in the same manner as Gauḍapāda has interpreted it; he differs from Colebrooke and from Lassen whose translations are based on the authority of the *Sāṁkhyacandrikā*, as Wilson has shown. Wilson himself has understood in the same way as the Chinese translator.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*In reasoning by comparison*', etc. Among the (three) methods of inference, reasoning by analogy is here mentioned. Objects like Nature and the Spirit are beyond the senses, and it is by analogy alone that one knows them. The effects, that is to say, Mahat (the Intellect) and the others, have each three qualities: joy, anxiety, blindness.[1] They are the qualities of products. The qualities of the products do not exist without those of the root (Nature). From the products we can infer the root. Thus Nature is known through reasoning by analogy from her products. The Spirit ought to exist, because her [Nature's] products, that is to say, Mahat (the Intellect), and the others exist only because (the knowing subject) exists. Thus, Spirit also is established by analogy.[2] If there is any point whatever which one cannot know either by perception or by inference, one can comprehend it by referring to sacred authority, since it is beyond the domain of our intelligence; for example, Sakra, the Lord of the Heavens, Uttarakuru (in the North), etc.

One may ask: 'Nature and the Spirit do not exist, because one does not see them, in the same way as the second head or the third arm of some one who is not the self-existent God'. Replying to that we say that we have eight sorts of objects invisible, but existent, for in real existence there are several phases. What are these eight? We shall show them in this verse:

VII. Because they are too far or too near; because the organs are imperfect or because the mind is troubled; because of their smallness [subtlety] or because an obstacle is interposed; because the objects press them or prevail over them; or because other similar objects accumulate (the objects, though existent, are invisible).

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

Among the objects really existing in the world, there are those which are invisible because of their *distance;* thus an object fallen on the other bank is not seen by the men on this bank.[3] Others are invisible because of their *proximity;* thus, a particle of dust in the eye cannot be perceived. Others are imperceptible because of the *defectiveness of the organs*; thus, the blind or the deaf cannot see or hear. Others are obscured by the *trouble of the mind*, for one is incapable

[1] That is to say, *sukha, duḥkha, moha*. These terms are employed here in the same sense as *sattva, rajas, tamas*. See further on, v. XII.
[2] See further on, v. XVII, commentary.
[3] Gauḍapāda employs here, as usual, a simpler example.

of thinking of a given subject, when the mind is elsewhere. Invisibility because of *smallness*; thus, the smoke, the heat, the dust and the vapour dispersed in the atmosphere cannot be seen. Invisibility because of an *obstacle*; thus, an object behind a wall cannot be known. Invisibility because of the *predominance* (*of another object*); thus, when the Sun rises, the light of the Moon and the stars cannot be seen. Invisibility because of *resemblance*; thus, a bean cannot be distinguished in a mass of beans, because all the beans are of the same kind. Among existing objects, these eight cannot be seen.

Besides these, there are still four objects which (now) do not exist and for that reason cannot be seen:

(1) Invisibility of an object before its production; thus, seeing a lump of clay, one cannot see the utensil which will be made out of it;

(2) Invisibility, because the object has been destroyed; thus, when a pitcher has been broken, one knows no more of its form;

(3) Invisibility because of mutual exclusion; thus, in a horse, one cannot recognise a cow, and *vice versa*;

(4) Invisibility because of absolute absence; for example, the the second head or the third arm of some one who is not Īśvara.[1]

These twelve sorts of existences or of non-existences are invisible. If you say that Nature and Spirit do not exist, because invisible, your opinion is not, then, admissible.

Some one will ask: 'If, as you say, Nature and Spirit are invisible, to which of the twelve categories do they belong?' Here is the reply: 'For a certain cause they are invisible'. What is that cause? We explain that in this verse.

VIII. It is because of her subtlety that Nature cannot be seen, and not because she does not exist. Mahat (the Intellect) and the others are her effects, of which some are not similar to Nature, while others are similar to her.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*It is because of her subtlety that Nature cannot be seen, and not because she does not exist*'. Nature exists really, but, being too subtle, she cannot be seen, even as smoke or other similar things dispersed in the atmosphere cannot be seen, because they are too fine. Nature, then, is not non-existent, [and] invisible in consequence, like the second head or the third arm.... Some one may ask:

[1] The explanation of the four non-existent objects is superfluous in this place. Gauḍapāda has been well-advised to omit it completely. [But see *Māṭhara-vṛtti*, v. VII.]

'If she is invisible, how can you know that she exists?' Here is the reply: 'The cause can be seen by its effects. Nature is the cause; what she produces, they are her effects. The existence of Nature can be inferred by analogy from her effects. What are her effects? Mahat (the Intellect) and the others are her effects. Nature produces Mahat, Mahat produces the Sentiment of self, the Sentiment of self produces the five subtle elements, the five subtle elements produce the remaining sixteen, that is to say, the eleven organs of sense and action, and the five gross elements. The effects, that is to say, Mahat and the others, are endowed with the three qualities (*guṇa*) and we know that these same qualities are equally inherent in Nature'[1].

'*Some are not similar to Nature, while others are similar to her*'. The effects can be divided into two sorts: similar or dissimilar to Nature; thus, a man begets two children, one of whom resembles the father, while the other does not resemble him at all. Among the products of one and the same cause, there are some which resemble the original principle, and others, which resemble it in nothing. This will be explained further on.[2] That is the opinion of this school and of others on the subject of effects.

Some one may ask: 'If the disciples ought to follow (a doctrine as) their principle, whence comes it that some affirm that the effects exist already in the cause, while the others affirm the contrary, and others finally assert that the effects are neither existent nor non-existent in the cause? For, the opinions of the wise differ thus. There are some wise ones who affirm that a pot and other earthen utensils exist already in the lump of clay, which serves to make them.[3] The Vaiśeṣikas maintain that at first they do not exist, and that later they exist (that is to say, the effect is not in the cause). According to the disciples of Śākyamuni, a pot is neither existent nor non-existent in the lump of clay.[4] We have then three opinions,

[1] We should always remind ourselves that all that exists is endowed with the three guṇas. To speak of the existence of the guṇas of an object amounts to saying that the object itself exists.

[2] See v. X, commentary.

[3] This is the opinion which consists in saying that the effect exists in the cause (Sāṁkhya doctrine).

[4] There is a reference to these passages in the commentary on the *Śataśāstra* (translated in 608; It is not included in the editions of the Chinese Tripiṭaka). Here it is: 'In the "Golden Seventy" (Sāṁkhyakārikā), the opinions of the two schools are refuted, and the opinion of the Sāṁkhya school is established. The two schools are: (1) The doctrine of Ṛṣabha (Le-cha-p'o . . .), who maintains that the effect is neither existent nor non-existent in the cause; (2) The doctrine of the Vaiśeṣikas, who assert that the effect does not exist in the cause'. This citation informs us that the Chinese text, to which the commentator on the *Śataśāstra* refers, contained here 'Ṛṣabha' in the place of 'Śākyamuni.' But Ṛṣabha is the name given to the Saint of the Jainas; the Chinese have explained it by Ni-k'ien-tse . . . = Nirgranthika. An Indian

and we prefer the middle one to the others'. Replying to that, we shall refute first the opinion of Śākyamuni, later that of the Vaiśeṣikas. The opinion of Śākyamuni, 'neither existent nor non-existent', is inadmissible, because it is self-contradictory. To say non-existent, that would be to say nothing. To say 'not non-existent', that is to say 'existent.' Existence and non-existence together make a contradiction; it is as if you should say 'that man is neither dead nor living.' As that opinion is self-contradictory, it cannot be maintained. Thus it is with the doctrine of Śākyamuni.[1]

(Note of Paramārtha :—This refutation, (that is to say, the last phrase) is false. Why? Because Śākyamuni had not such an opinion. When Śākyamuni affirms non-existence, he does not wish to say [it is] nothing. He does not wish to declare existence either, when he says that it is not non-existent, for, he does not insist on either of the two extremes. The refutation, then, does not affect Buddhism, in any way.)

Now, we go on to refute the doctrine of the Vaiśeṣikas. In our opinion, there are five reasons, which demonstrate the existence of the effect in the cause. What are these five reasons?

IX. From nothing nothing can be made. It is necessary to take (the material, which will serve as) cause. All the objects are not the product (of any cause whatsoever). The capable agent alone can accomplish a given action. As is the cause, so is the effect. For all these reasons, we maintain that the effect exists already in the cause.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

(1) '*From nothing nothing can be made*'. In the world, where there exists nothing, any attempt to produce has no result. Thus, oil cannot be produced from sand. But if the materials exist, an object can be produced. Thus, by pressing sesamum, one gets oil. The product cannot be obtained, if it does not exist in the object. Now, we observe that Mahat (Intellect) and the other principles are the products of Nature; we know then that the principles are contained in Nature herself.

(2) '*It is necessary to take (the materials, which will serve as) cause.*' If a man has the need to make an object, he necessarily takes

version of our text ought to have this variant. It would, perhaps, be better to read here throughout Ṛṣabha in the place of Śākyamuni. See, lower down, the note of Paramārtha.

[1] The refutation is directed against Buddhism and Jainism. Paramārtha, in his note, explains it in such a manner as to place Buddhism out of the question.

the cause of that object; thus, a man who thinks that to-morrow a brāhmin will come to dine in his house procures milk to make curds. Why does he not take water? Because, to make an object, one ought to take the cause of that object. We see then that Mahat pre-exists in Nature.

(3) '*All the objects are not the product* (*of any cause whatsoever*)'. If the effects did not exist in the cause, it would not matter which is the product of which cause. Grass, gravel or stones could then produce gold or silver. But such phenomena do not exist. We see then that the effects are contained in the cause.

(4) '*The capable agent alone can accomplish a given action*'. For example, a potter with his instruments makes pitchers and plates from a lump of clay, but he is not capable of making these utensils, using plants or trees. We know then that Nature implies her derivatives.

(5) '*As the cause, so the effect*'. The effect is of the same class as the cause. Thus, shoots of barley come from seeds of barley. If the effect did not exist in the cause, the fruit could not be of the same class as the seed. In this case, the seeds of barley would be able to produce shoots of beans or some other thing. As we do not know such phenomena, we see that the effects are existent in the cause. The Vaiśeṣikas assert that the effects do not exist in the cause; but their opinion is inadmissible. We know that the effects exist necessarily in the cause.

Continuing to reply to the question, I resume the explanation of the preceding verse; as for the dissimilarity of the effects with Nature, there are nine points to observe:[1]

X. The evolved principles have a cause, are impermanent, multiple, limited, endowed with action, dissoluble, possessing parts, residing in another and dependent on another; (in these points) evolved principles differ from Nature (the non-evolved principle).

Sanskrit Kārikā.

Commentary.

(1) '*Have a cause*'. All (the principles), Mahat and the others, up to the five gross elements, have a cause. Nature is the cause of Mahat, which itself is the cause of the Sentiment of self; the Sentiment of self is itself the cause of the subtle elements; the sixteen

[1] The commentary agrees with that of Gauḍapāda, almost word for word. These arguments may be traditional in the Sāṁkhya school, but an agreement so close is not, however, an act of chance. These lines, even as some others, are found in the commentary on the Chinese text.—For the exposition of the ninth verse, I refer to Wilson's note in his *Sāṁkhya-kārikā*, where one will find a good comparison of Sāṁkhya doctrines with European systems.

categories, that is to say, the five organs of sense and the others,[1] have for cause the five subtle elements. In the case of Nature, it is not thus, for, she is not the product of a cause. That is why one says she is not similar (to the other principles).

(2) '*Impermanent*'. Mahat and the others are produced by Nature. Being products, they are not permanent. There are two sorts of impermanence: (*a*) that which lasts a certain time; (*b*) that which changes at every moment. So long as a cause of change does not intervene, a thing remains what it is. Thus, a forest or other similar things remain what they are, so long as fire does not destroy them; but when the calamity of fire befalls them, the five gross elements and the others resolve themselves into the five subtle elements and the others, the five subtle elements in the Sentiment of self, the Sentiment of self in the Mahat, and Mahat itself in Nature. That is why one says that Mahat and the others are impermanent and that Nature is not so; for, she is permanent, and does not resolve herself into another thing.

(3) '*Multiple*'. This means that Mahat and the others are or diverse sorts, for, men are not similar, each to the rest. It is thus with the Sentiment of self and the others. But Nature is one, for, she is common to all men.

(4) '*Limited*'. Nature and Spirit (the Self) extend everywhere on the earth, in the [middle] space, and in heaven; but for the other categories, Mahat and the others, it is quite different, for, they never extend everywhere. In this, they differ from Nature.

(5) '*Endowed with action.*'—Mahat and the others, when they are on the point of originating or going out, are capable, by means of the thirteen instruments,[1] to make the subtle body migrate in birth or death, to extend itself or to contract itself, to go or to come; they are, in consequence, endowed with action. It is not thus with Nature, for, of her there is neither expansion nor contraction.

(6) '*Dissoluble*'. Mahat and all the other categories are dissoluble, because they are no longer visible, when all the evolved principles are returned to their origin (that is to say, to Nature). For example, when the five gross elements are resolved into the five subtle elements, we do not see them any more; even so, when Mahat is resolved into Nature, we see it no more. But it is not thus with with Nature, for, there is no dissolution of her.

(7) '*Possessing parts*'. Mahat and the others all have parts, and all the parts are different, each from the rest. It is not thus with Nature, for, she is permanent and indivisible.

[1] That is to say, the five gross elements, the five organs of action, and the *manas*.

(8) '*Residing in another*'. This means that Mahat resides in Nature, the Sentiment of self in Mahat, the five subtle elements in the Sentiment of self, and the sixteen—that is to say, the five gross elements and the others—in the five subtle elements. It is not thus with Nature, for, she is not produced by another thing.

(9) '*Dependent on another*'. Mahat and the others have been produced since the beginning, and products do not exist by themselves; just as, as long as a father lives, his children have no independent existence. In this sense, one says that they are dependent. It is not thus with Nature, for, the source cannot depend on another thing.

For these nine reasons, the source and the product are dissimilar; that is why one says that they do not resemble each other.

Their dissimilarity is thus explained, and I go now to speak of their similarity. These similarities are all set forth in this verse:

XI. The source is similar to the product, for, both are endowed with the three guṇas, *inseparable, objective, common to all, unconscious, prolific. Spirit is neither similar nor dissimilar.*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ

Commentary.

The similarities are of six sorts:

(1) '*Endowed with the three guṇas*'. By evolved principles we understand Mahat the Sentiment of self, etc., up to the five gross elements. These twenty-three possess the three guṇas, that is to say, joy, misery, ignorance.[1] As the products are endowed with the three guṇas, we infer that their source too is endowed with them; for, the products are not different from their source, even as a black cloth is made of black thread; the effect thus produced resembles in its colour the original material. Since the evolved principles have the three guṇas, and the evolved is derived from the source, we know then that Nature also is endowed with the (three) guṇas. That is why it is said that the source and the products are similar.

(2) '*Inseparable*'. The evolved principles cannot be separated from their three guṇas. We distinguish the body of a cow from that of a horse; the two cannot be considered as one. For the evolved in their relations with their three guṇas, the case is quite different from that (example). Just like the evolved, Nature too has three guṇas. As they are equally inseparable, (it is said that) the source and the products resemble each other.

[1] The translator has used here terms which are too strong [wide] to translate *triguṇas*, but lower down he translates correctly; see v. XII.

(3) '*Objective*'. The evolved, Mahat and the others, are employed by Spirit; that is why one says that they are objective. It is the same with Nature; she is employed by Spirit.

(4) '*Common to all*'. The evolved, Mahat and the others, are common to all individual selves, even as a servant who has many masters, each one of whom employs her and makes her work. It is the same with Nature; all individual selves use her at the same time. That is why it is said that they are similar.

(5) '*Unconscious*'. The evolved, Mahat and the others, are incapable of knowing and judging of an object, if it is agreeable, painful or indifferent. As Spirit alone is endowed with reason, all the things separated [distinct] from Spirit do not have reason. Nature too then is deprived of it. The source and the products are thus equally unconscious and resemble each other in this point.

(6) '*Prolific*'. Mahat is capable of producing the Sentiment of self, that the five subtle elements, and so on up to the five gross elements. Nature too is capable of producing Mahat; the source and the products then resemble each other.

(7) '*Spirit is neither similar nor dissimilar*'. The evolved principles and Nature are similar in these six points, while for Spirit there is not such similarity. There is then the opposite of similarity. The evolved principles and Nature are dissimilar in the nine points (enumerated in v. X), while in the case of Spirit, there is dissimilarity (with the evolved principles) in eight points of the nine; it is in that that it is said to be dissimilar. Spirit differs from Nature in this point alone, that it is multiple. [1]

Some one may say: 'It has been explained that the evolved principles and Nature are endowed with the three guṇas. What now

[1] In this relation, Spirit (*ātman*) behaves like an evolved principle (*vyaktam*); in that [relationship], it is the opposite of eight among the nine characteristics of the non-evolved principle (*avyaktam*), that is to say, of Nature. [The latter half of this sentence makes no sense; what M. Takakusu wants to say seems to be fairly clear from the succeeding sentences, but his mode of saying it in the last sentence is certainly not happy. The French of it is given for the benefit of those who may like to make an attempt at it for themselves.—'en cela elle est l'opposé de huit parmi les neuf caracteristiques du principe non evolué (*avyaktam*), c'est-à-dire de la Nature'.] While Nature is one, Spirit is multiple. This point is well-established in the Chinese text, even as in the *Sāṁkhyasūtra*, 149 (Garbe, *Sāṁkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya*, p. 67): janmādivyavasthātaḥ puruṣabahutvam; in the *Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudī*, v. XI (Calcutta ed., p. 60; Garbe, *Mondschein*, p. 568): puruṣasya evam anekatvam vyaktasādharmyam; and in the *Sāṁkhyacandrikā*, v. XI: evam vyaktasarūpy apy anekasaṁkhyāyeti. The text of Gauḍapāda: 'anekam vyaktam ekam avyaktam tathā pumān apy ekaḥ' differs then essentially from the Chinese and the Indian texts we have just cited. Wilson has attempted to place these opinions in harmony, but his explanation is rather forced. [Cf. Māṭhara: tad yathā vyaktād visadṛśam pradhānam tathā pradhāna-sadharmā puruṣaḥ. tathā hi: ahetumān nityo vyāpī niṣkriya *eko* nāśrito 'liṅgo niravayavaḥ svatantra iti.]

are the characteristics of the three guṇas?' We reply in this verse:

XII. Pleasure, misery [pain] and ignorance are the nature of the three guṇas; to shine, to produce and to bind are their functions; for each to dominate the rest, for each to depend on the rest, for each to originate the rest, to form pairs and to intervene (one for the other), these are their properties.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Pleasure, etc., are their nature*'. The guṇas are (1) *sattva*, (2) *rajas*, (3) *tamas*. Pleasure is the nature of *sattva*, misery is that of *rajas*, and obscurity or stupidity is that of *tamas*. This is how their three characteristics manifest themselves.

'*To shine, etc., are their functions*'. What are the actions of the three guṇas? The first (sattva) is capable of shining or illuminating, the seccond (rajas) of producing, and the third (tamas) of binding. These are the functions appropriate to the three guṇas.

What, now, are the properties of the three guṇas? They are five in number:

(1) '*For each to dominate the rest*'. If joy (sattva) predominates, it is capable of subjugating misery or indifference, even as the brilliance of the Sun is capable of hiding the Moon and the stars. If misery (rajas) is preponderant, it subjugates joy and indifference, even as the rays of the Sun hide the Moon and the stars. If indifference predominates, it subdues misery and joy, even as in the brilliant light of the Sun, the Moon and the stars do not show themselves.

(2) '*For each to depend on the rest*'. The three guṇas dependent each on the other, are capable of performing all things, even as three sticks leaning each on the other can support a basin for ablution.

(3) '*For each to originate the rest*'. Sometimes joy produces misery and indifference, sometimes misery produces joy and indifference, sometimes indifference originates misery and joy. Just as three men dependent on one another perform an act, even so the three guṇas residing in the Mahat and the others, and dependent on one another, produce birth and death.

(4) '*To form pairs*'. Joy forms sometimes a pair with misery or else with indifference. Misery too sometimes forms a pair with joy or indifference, which in its turn, forms pairs with joy or misery, as is explained in the verse of the ṛsi P'o-so:[1] 'joy is coupled with

[1] . . . . P'o-so is probably Vyāsa. Paramārtha often employs. . [the symbol for P'o] to transcribe *vyā*: *cf.* lower down, v. XXIX, note 4, where *p'o-na* transcribes *vyāna*.—Gauḍapāda cites this verse, but without giving its source.

misery, misery with joy, sometimes joy or misery is coupled with indifference'.

(5) '*Intervene one for the other*'. Each one of the three guṇas produces the acts of the other : (*a*) Suppose a lady of a royal line, whose countenance and form are extremely beautiful. This can be called the guṇa of joy. This guṇa, it is the beauty, which gives pleasure to her husband, and to his family. Up to this, the guṇa of beauty exercises, then, its appropriate action. But that lady can stir up envy or suffering in other ladies of equal position. In this case, the joy produces, then, the effect of another guṇa (that is to say, of rajas). But it produces also the effect of yet another (guṇa), that is to say, of indifference (tamas); thus, her servants, always weary of serving her, and not having the means of delivering themselves, are of sombre and depressed humour; that is why one says that this guṇa produces the effect of another guṇa (that is to say, of tamas). All this would say that the guṇa of joy is capable of producing its own offects and those of the others. (*b*) The guṇa of misery (rajas) produces its own effects and those of the others. Suppose a bandit has captured that lady of royal lineage, and that a prince, mounted on a horse and holding a whip in his hand, comes to deliver her. Here, misery becomes the presence of the prince. Though the prince be the object of fear, his presence in this case makes the lady rejoice at the thought of being delivered by him. This would say that (the guṇa of misery) produces the effect of another (that is to say, of sattva). But as the prince will kill the bandit, (his presence) causes misery to that one. One says, then, that misery produces its own effect. The other bandits are made motionless like the trunks of trees, at the sight of the prince. One says, then, that misery (rajas) works the effect of another, that is to say, of stupor (tamas). All this makes [one] see that misery produces its own effect and those of the others. (*c*) Stupor too produces its own effect and those of the others. Suppose a black cloud, thick and vast, which produces lightning, etc. The guṇa of stupor (tamas) is, then, cloud. The peasants who sow and plant will rejoice at it. One can, then, say that it produces the effect of another guṇa (that is to say, of sattva). But it also produces its own effect : suppose a loving lady separated from her husband; at the sight of the cloud and the lightning, she will be depressed, thinking that her husband will be incapable of returning to the house. Producing stupor (tamas) to the lady, one can then say that stupor produces its own effect. But it also produces misery. Suppose some merchants on the way, suffering from humidity and

The verse is given in entirety by Vācaspatimiśra in his *Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudī*, where it is called an āgama (atrāgamaḥ).

cold, not able to support them ; they will have vexation from it. This is the production of the effect of another guṇa (that is to say, of rajas).

These five are the properties pertaining to the three guṇas. They have, besides, their special marks :

XIII. Sattva *has for characteristic, lightening and illumining,* rajas, *holding and moving,* tamas, *weighting and enveloping. The union of the contraries is similar to a lamp.*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Sattva ...... illumining*'. What is light and luminous is *sattva.* When *sattva* predominates, all the organs (of action and of sense) are light, brilliant and refined, capable of seizing all the objects. It is proper to know that it is in this case that sattva predominates.

'*Rajas, holding and moving*'. 'To hold' means to have the mind excited without taking others into account ; thus, an elephant in fury, desiring to fight, engages in fight at the sight of an enemy elephant. When *rajas* predominates, man seeks the fight, for, his mind is constantly agitated, and he cannot keep himself tranquil. It is proper to know that it is in this case that rajas predominates.

'*Tamas, weighting and enveloping*'. When the guṇa of tamas increases, the whole body becomes heavy ; all the organs (of action and of sense) being enveloped, one is incapable of perceiving an object. It is proper to know that it is in this case that tamas predominates.

One may ask : 'If the three guṇas are opposed to one another like enemies, how can they do anything together ?' In reply we say : 'The three guṇas are, indeed, opposed to one another, as you say, but, pertaining to one individual self, and not being independent, they are capable of doing something together. It is thus that the three different materials are united to make a lamp. The fire is different from the oil and the wick, and the oil is different from the wick and the fire ; nevertheless, these materials, opposed to one another, produce (by uniting themselves) an effect for men. It is even thus with the three guṇas. Though opposed to one another, in their nature, they act (together) for Spirit'.

One will ask : 'You have mentioned higher up (commentary, v. XI) six sorts of resemblance (between Nature and her products), and I have understood the first ; but I do not know the five others. You have explained with success the three guṇas (that is to say, the first point of resemblance) ; you ought to treat of the five other (points of resemblance) also.' The reply is given in these lines ;

XIV. Inseparability and the other (properties) can be established by the (three) guṇas, and by the non-existence of the contrary. The non-evolved principle can be demonstrated by the attributes of the effects, which agree with those of their causes.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Inseparability .... be established*'. The meaning of the five (properties), inseparability, etc., has already (v. XI) been explained. (Their existence) in the evolved principles has already been established. It can be equally established in the case of Nature, in consequence of the effects (of which Nature is the cause).

'*By the (three) guṇas and by the non-existence of the contrary*'. We have proved that the five properties, inseparability, etc., exist in the evolved principles, and we infer that they exist certainly in Nature too (the non-evolved principle). How? By the three guṇas. As the three guṇas do not exist independently (of the evolved principles), we know that they are not separable therefrom. If they are inseparable therefrom, we know that the guṇas and the evolved principles ought to be considered as objects (that is to say, that they are not the knowing subject). If we call them objects, we infer that they are common to all.[1] If all enjoy it equally, we know that they are unconscious.[2] They are objective, universal and unconscious; it follows from this that they are prolific. Knowing that the six characteristics exist in the evolved principle, we know that they exist in Nature too. 'How do you know that?' If the contrary were the case,[3] then they would not exist at all; in other words, if we suppress the six properties of the cause, *i.e.*, of Nature, the six properties of the effects could not exist any more. Even thus, if we take away the threads, there is no longer the cloth; where there is the cloth, there are the threads,[4] the threads and the

[1] That is to say, that all individual souls ought to enjoy them.

[2] That which enjoys (i.e., Spirit) alone, being conscious.

[3] . . . It is difficult to see what 'the contrary' relates to. It is certainly not Spirit, as Colebrooke and Vācaspatimiśra understand it (Garbe, *Mondschein*, v. 14). The Chinese text speaks here of *prakṛti* and seems to mean this: 'It is a fact that five properties exist in the *vyaktam*. They ought equally to exist in *prakṛti* (*avyaktam*). In effect, if there were room for the contrary, that is to say, if they did not exist in *prakṛti*, these properties would not exist in any fashion, even in the *vyaktam*. For, the effect (*vyaktam*) ought to accord with its cause (*avyaktam*)'. Gauḍapāda too seems to give a different explanation: see Wilson's note.

[4] . . . = Gauḍapāda: yatraiva tantavas tatraiva paṭaḥ. [Cf. Māṭhara: iha hi yatra tantavas tatraiva paṭaḥ, yatra paṭas tatraiva tantavaḥ, etc.].

cloth being inseparable. The effects proceed necessarily from a cause; the cause and the effect are inseparable.

'*The attributes of the effects, which agree with those of their causes*'. In the world, the attributes of all the effects are in accord with those of their causes, even as a cloth made of red thread produces an effect of red colour. It is the same with the evolved principles. By the three guṇas, the existence of the five other characteristics can be proved. By the six characteristics of the effect, we infer the existence of the same six characteristics in the non-evolved principle (Nature). One may ask: 'If there is in the world an object impossible to show, that object is considered as non-existent, like the second head (of a man). No more can Nature be demonstrated. How do you know that she exists?' We reply: 'The weight of the Himālaya is unknown; nevertheless, one cannot say that it has no weight. It is the same with Nature'. 'For what other reasons do you know her existence?'

XV. Because the specific classes are finite; because there is homogeneity; because there is production effectuated by energy; because there is a difference between cause and effect; because there is no distinction in the form of the universe.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

How do you know the real existence of Nature?

(1) '*Because the specific classes are finite*'. In the world, a produced thing has a measure, a dimension, a number; thus with a given quantity of clay, the potter makes vases of a limited number. Suppress the original matter (clay), and there will no more be either numerical measure or vase. Seeing that the vases have a numerical measure, we know that they have an original matter. The comparison of the threads constituting a cloth is equally applicable. Among the (twenty-five) principles, the evolved principles, Mahat and the others, possess equally a numerical measure. What is that numerical measure? Mahat is one, the Sentiment of self is one, the subtle elements are five, the organs are eleven, and the gross elements five. As for the evolved principles, we see that they have a numerical measure. In reasoning by analogy, we know that there is a Nature (source) [1]. If there were not a Nature, the evolved principles would not have numerical measure, and the principles themselves would not exist.

[1] See v. VI.

(2) '*Because there is homogeneity*'. When we break a piece of sandal, the fragments of sandal may be numerous, but the nature of sandal will remain one; it is the same with the evolved principles. Mahat and the others differ from one another, but the nature of their three guṇas is one. From this, that the nature (of the three guṇas) is the same, we infer that all (the evolved principles) have a (common) source, and thus we know the existence of Nature (*prakṛti*).

(3) '*Because there is production effectuated by energy*'. Where there is energy, there is production; thus, a potter capable of producing earthen utensils can produce earthen utensils alone, but not clothes, etc. The production of objects is made only by power. This power has necessarily a source, that is to say, the potter himself. It is the same with the evolved principles. Their production is effectuated by energy. As they are produced by energy, we know the existence of Nature.

(4) '*Because there is difference between cause and effect*'. The difference between cause and effect can be observed in the world; for example, a piece of clay is the cause; a pitcher, etc., is the effect. These utensils can keep water, oil, etc., while clay cannot do that. The difference between cause and effect can be further illustrated by the example of the threads and the cloth. Then, Mahat and the other evolved principles are really effects. Seeing these effects, we know that there is an independent cause, of a different character. We know by that that Nature exists.

(5) '*Because there is no difference in the form of the universe*'. There is yet a special reason for which we affirm that Nature really exists. By form of the universe, it is necessary to understand the three worlds: earth, (intermediate) space, heaven. In the period of reality (that is to say, general dissolution, *pralayakāla*), the worlds have no longer any distinction. The five gross elements and the eleven organs (of sense and action) resolve themselves into the five subtle elements, and have no longer any difference; further, Mahat is re-united to Nature and ceases to be differentiated. We can no longer say which is the evolved and which the non-evolved. One may think: 'As at the time of reality [dissolution] there are not evolved principles, there is not Nature either; if there is not Nature, there is neither birth nor death'. That idea is incorrect. The reality of Nature will reproduce the three worlds (after the general dissolution). We know then the existence of Nature.

For these five reasons we affirm that Nature exists.

'Though Nature exists,' one will say, 'she would not be able to produce the evolved, because she has no concomitant (cause); thus, a man alone cannot give birth to an infant, and a single thread makes

not a cloth. And it is thus with Nature'. In reply, we utter these lines:

XVI. Nature is the cause of the production of the evolved principles. For, the three guṇas produce the effects by their union and by their transformation; (this is so) as of water, because the guṇas differ one from another.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Nature is the cause . . .*' This means that, possessing the three guṇas, Nature is capable of producing the evolved principles. If Nature were not endowed with the (three) guṇas, your words (that Nature alone cannot produce any effect) could be exact. But if Nature possesses the three guṇas, it is not correct to say that (not having a concomitant, Nature) cannot produce an effect.

'*The three guṇas produce the effects . . . .*' Just as many threads produce together a cloth, even so the three guṇas, associating with one another, are capable of producing an effect. One may ask: 'In the world, production is of two sorts. In the first place, there is production by transformation: milk produces cream etc. In the second place, there is production without transformation. Thus, parents give birth to a child. To what class of production belongs that of the evolved principles by Nature?' We reply: 'There is transformation, even as milk produces cream. It is in transforming herself that Nature produces the evolved principles; the evolved is not then a thing other than Nature. This being the case, the production of specific classes (birth) cannot be comprised under that (sort of production)'. One may ask: 'But one cause can by no means produce different sorts of effects. If then Nature is one, how can she produce the three worlds? Those who are born in heaven are joyous and happy, those who are born among men are plunged in pain and misery, and those who are born among animals are sombre and dark. If they all proceed from a single cause, how does it happen that there are these three degrees?' Here is the reply:

'*(This is so) as of water, because the three guṇas differ one from another*'. 'The water which comes from the atmosphere is, at the beginning, of a single taste. It transforms itself when it arrives on the earth. It becomes of a varied taste, according to the different receptacles.'[1] If it is a vase of gold, its taste is very sweet; if it is in the earth, its taste differs, according to the quality of the earth. It is the same with the three worlds. Though produced by a single

[1] The words within quotation-marks form a verse in the Chinese.

(cause), that is to say, by Nature, (the effects differ), as the three guṇas differ one from another. In heaven, *sattva* predominates, and for that the gods are constantly happy ; among men *rajas* abounds, that is why the majority of men suffer misery ; *tamas* exercises its power among the animals, that is why animals are always sombre. In all the worlds, the three guṇas operate always mutually, but as there is a predominance (of one over another) we have the differences which we have just seen. Thus, while still being one, Nature can produce the three worlds, but it is the inequality of the three guṇas which produces good or evil.

We have already examined Nature in entirety, and we come to pass to (its opposite), Spirit. How do we know that there is a Spirit, if it is subtle like Nature ? The existence of Spirit is demonstrated in the following lines :

XVII. Because all assemblage (of objects) is for another (object) ; because the contrary of the three guṇas ought to exist ; because it is necessary to have some one who resides ; because it is necessary to have some one who enjoys ; because one seeks absolute isolation (of Spirit) ; for these five reasons we affirm the existence of Spirit.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

If one comprehends what Nature and the products are, one obtains Deliverance (*mokṣa*), because one is then that which knows. This has been explained in the first verse. Later, enumerating the five causes, we have demonstrated Nature and the evolved principles (v. XIV). Spirit, which is very subtle, is to be demonstrated now. Spirit really exists.

1. '*Because all assemblage (of objects) is for another*'. We see that in the world all assemblages are for another object. Thus, beds, chairs, etc., assembled together, are necessarily for the use of others, and not for these objects themselves. There are others (objects or persons), who come to make use of these objects, and it is solely for that reason that they have been assembled. Reason, etc. exist then for others. It is the same with Mahat, etc. The assemblage of the five gross elements is called a (human) body. The body does not exist for itself ; we know with certainty that it exists for another. The other in this case is properly Spirit. We know then that Spirit really exists.

2. '*Because the contrary ought to exist*'. One has explained in a verse higher up (v. XI) that there are six points of similarity between the non-evolved principle and the evolved principles :

'They are endowed with the three guṇas, inseparable, objective, common to all, unconscious, and prolific'. The cause and the effects are similar in these points, but Spirit is opposed to similarity and to dissimilarity at the same time. Because it is opposed on the six points, we affirm the existence of Spirit.

3. '*Because it is necessary to have some one who resides*'. From the Spirit inhabiting the body, the latter becomes endowed with functions. If Spirit does not reside, then the body is not an agent. As is said in the *Treatise of the Sixty Categories* : 'Nature, it is that in which Spirit resides, and it is because of that that she can produce actions.' [1] By that we know that Spirit exists.

4. '*Because it is necessary to have some one who enjoys*'. In this world, when we see food and drink made fragrant in six ways, we infer that it is necessary to have some one who will eat and drink that ; even so when we see Mahat and the others, we know with certainty that, as in the case of food, some one will enjoy it. We know then that Spirit exists.

5. '*Because one seeks absolute isolation . . .*' If there were only our body, we should not have the need of the final Deliverance taught by the sages. In antiquity, a ṛṣi went to some brāhmins and spoke thus : 'All of you are rich in [the] Vedas ; all of you drink soma ; all of you see the face of a child ; could you later become bhikṣus ?'. [2] Of what good would such an idea be, if we had only the body ? We know then that by the side of the body it is naturally necessary to have a Spirit. If there were no distinct Spirit by the side of the body, religious practices like cremation or the throwing into the water of the remains of dead parents or masters would not have any merit, but might drag in demerit. For that reason we know that Spirit exists. Here are yet other words (in verse) of the

[1] It is to be remarked that Gauḍapāda, just like the Chinese (text), cites here the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*. The phrase : 'Nature, it is that in which Spirit resides,' supposes the Sanskrit *puruṣādhiṣṭhitam pradhānam pravartate* (see Gauḍapāda) [also Māṭhara]. *Ṣaṣṭitantra* is in Chinese......, 'Treatise of the Sixty Categories'. Paramārtha understands then by that the title of a special work, which confirms the opinion of Deussen and Garbe (see Garbe, *Mondschein*, p. 627, note 3). The sixty categories are also cited in v. LXXII (Gauḍapāda), but the Chinese text has here 'the fifty categories' (......), which are enumerated under v. XLVII, and mentioned in v. XLVI (pañcāśatbhedaḥ). The sixty categories are the fifty we have just mentioned and ten others, to wit : (1) Spirit, (2) Nature, (3) Intellect, (4) Sentiment of self, (5—7) the three guṇas, (8) the tanmātras, (9) the five elements, (10) the eleven indriyas. For another enumeration, see Wilson's note on v. LXXII. For a fuller discussion, see Garbe, *Sāṁkhyaphilosophie*, p. 58.

[2] These lines are difficult. The Chinese has . . . . Some Japanese authors explain . . . . [rendered here as *all*] by 'always' ; I attribute, however, to these characters the ordinary sense : 'all'. 'All of you see the face of an infant' is understood by some to mean "all of you have a youthful visage' (because you drink soma) ; some others explain it thus : 'all of you have accomplished the duty of a gṛhastha, in obtaining a child.'

sages : ' The nerves and bones are the cords and the posts, the blood and the flesh are the earth and the plaster ; (the body is the house of) impurity, impermanence and suffering. We have to rid ourselves of this aggregate. Reject that which is just and that which is unjust; reject that which is real and that which is unreal; and the very idea of rejecting,[1] reject that! That which is pure will alone remain '. If Spirit did not exist, nothing would remain (after such an elimination). By the words of the sages, we know with certainty that Spirit exists.

By the five reasons we have just given, the truth of the existence of Spirit is established. One may ask : ' What is the characteristic mark of Spirit ? Is there a single Spirit for all the bodies, or has each body its Spirit ? If you wish to know why I put you that question, I reply that it is because the opinions of the several masters contradict one another on this point. Some say that a single Spirit fills the bodies of all the beings ; thus, in a chaplet of strung pearls, the thread is one, while the pearls are numerous; thus, the sixteen thousand wives of Viṣṇu enjoy at the same moment. It is the same with the unique Spirit, which fills the bodies of all the beings. Other masters affirm that each body has a Spirit for itself. Thence the doubt which arises in me.' We reply: ' There are several Spirits. Where there is a body, there there is a Spirit.' How do we know that ? We explain that in the following verse :

XVIII. Because birth, death and the organs differ (with the individuals) ; because occupations are not the same (for all) ; because the three guṇas act differently, the principle of the individual Spirit is established.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Because birth, death . . . .*' In case Spirit were one, when one man is born, all the others would be born also. The women of different countries would become pregnant at the same time; they would be brought to bed at the same time ; they would have all boys or all girls. But as all (the individual spirits) are different, the births do not take place at the same time. We know that there is a plurality of spirits. If Spirit were one, at the death of one man all the other men would die also. As this is not the case, we know that Spirit is not one.

'*Because the organs differ*'. If Spirit were one, when one man becomes deaf, all the men would become deaf together. Blindness, aphasia, and all the maladies would be simultaneous in all. As this is not the case, we know that there is a plurality of spirits.

[1] . . . 6. ' the idea of some one who rejects,'

'*Because the three guṇas. . . .*' If there were a single Spirit, the three guṇas would not be different. But imagine a brāhmin who has given birth to three children, of whom the first is intelligent and happy, the second excitable and suffering, the third dull and stupid. If Spirit were one, one (of the children) being gay, the others ought to be that also; even so, in the case of stupidity. You have illustrated the unity of Spirit by the example of strung pearls and (the wives) of Viṣṇu. But your opinion is not correct. For the five reasons which we have just seen, we know that there is a plurality of spirits.

One may ask: 'There remains in me a doubt: should Spirit be considered as an agent or as a non-agent? If you wish to know why I have this doubt, I shall tell you: in the usual language one says: "Spirit goes, comes, acts."[1] According to the Sāṁkhya system, Spirit is not an agent, while it is an agent, according to the Vaiśeṣikas. In this way a doubt arises in me'. We reply: 'Spirit is not an agent'. How can we know that? We explain that in these lines:

XIX. Because (it is) at the same time the opposite of Nature and the products the fact that Spirit is a witness is established; it is isolated, neutral, a spectator, and passive.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Because it is the opposite. . . .*' As is explained in two preceding verses (X & XI), Spirit differs from Nature and the evolved principles. Being the opposite of the characteristics of the two, it has no resemblance to them. Now, the three guṇas are the agents, and Spirit is their opposite; it is then a non-agent. One may ask: 'To what [end] will it serve you, this statement that Spirit is not an agent?'

To establish the fact that it is a witness.—'*Spirit is a witness*', because it is knowing, but that is not the case with the other principles (the twenty-four tattvas). It is '*isolated*'; being the opposite of Nature and the products, it is isolated (from the three guṇas), because it is pure. It is '*neutral*'; the three guṇas are variable, since they are endowed with expansion and contraction. Spirit is different from them; that is why one says it is neutral. Just

[1] Gauḍapāda: loke puruṣaḥ kartā gamtetyādi prayujyate. [*Cf.* Māṭhara: loke tāvat puruṣo gacchati dhāvati tiṣṭhati śocati, puruṣeṇe 'dam kṛtam iti vipratipattiḥ].

as an ascetic mendicant resides at the same place and does not follow the persons who come and go, but contents himself with looking at them go about, even so Spirit simply looks at events, while the three guṇas expand and contract themselves (that is to say, submit to changes) in birth and death. That is why one says it is neutral. Being the opposite of Nature and the products (which are unconscious), Spirit is conscious, and that is why one calls it '*spectator*'. Finally, one says further that Spirit is '*passive*'. That the three guṇas may be agents, that has been shown; and that Spirit exists really, that it may be diverse and passive, that has been equally established.

Some one will ask: 'If Spirit is not an agent, to what pertains then the act of determination? Suppose that at this moment I have to practise religious duties, to renounce evil or to realise a vow, by whom will the act of will be made? If it were by the three guṇas, the three guṇas would be conscious, since it is (an act of intelligence). But it has been said previously that the three guṇas are unconscious (v. XI). If it is Spirit that determines the act, Spirit is an agent; but it has been said that Spirit is not an agent (v. XIX). There is then a dilemma'. The reply is in this verse:

XX. As the three guṇas are conjoined with Spirit, the unconscious appears to be conscious. As the three guṇas are the agents, the neutral seems to be an agent.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*As the three guṇas . . .*'. The three guṇas are unconscious, but agents, while Spirit is conscious, but inactive. When the two are conjoined, the guṇas appear to be conscious. Just as a vase of gold, placed in contact with fire, becomes hot, and placed in contact with water, becomes cold, thus, the three guṇas conjoined to the knower (Spirit) are conscious and effect the act of will. That is why one says that the unconscious appears to be conscious. You say that, according to the common speech of the world, Spirit ought to be an agent. To that we reply here:

'*As the three guṇas are the agents, the neutral appears to be an agent*'. Because of its union with the guṇas, Spirit is called an agent, though not being that. A brāhmin, [who has] got in by error into the company of brigands, is taken with the brigands, punished with them and called a brigand, for he was with them; it is the same with Spirit; because it is conjoined to agents, one says, in the com-

mon language of the world, that it is an agent. One may ask : ' How can Nature unite herself to Spirit ? ' We reply in this verse :

XXI. Spirit seeking to see (Nature with) the three guṇas, and Nature wishing to procure (for Spirit) absolute isolation, unite together, like the paralytic and the blind. By this means, the world is created.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Spirit seeking to see . . .*'. Spirit has this desire : ' I wish to see Nature with the three guṇas' ; and thus it unites itself with Nature.

'*Nature wishing to procure (for Spirit) . . .*'. Spirit, in the presence of a difficulty, is not capable of seeing and knowing ; with the intention ' of procuring it absolute isolation ' Nature unites herself to Spirit ; just as the king of a nation unites himself to his people with the intention ' of employing them to his ends,' and the people unite themselves with the king, with the intention ' that he should make them live ' [1]. Thus is effected the union of the king and his people. It is for one and the same end that the union of Spirit and Nature is effected, Spirit seeking to see Nature, and Nature desiring the absolute isolation of Spirit.

'*Like the paralytic and the blind.*' Here is an example. There was once upon a time a caravan, which proceeded to Ujjayini ; it was attacked by a band of brigands. Having had the worst [of the fight], all the merchants fled and dispersed, abandoning one [who was] blind from birth, and one [who was] paralytic from birth. The blind one ran here and there, in vain, while the infirm one was seated and looked on. The infirm one asked him : 'Who are you ?' The other replied : ' I am blind from birth. Not knowing the road, I run without aim. But who are you ?' The infirm one replied : ' I am paralytic from birth. I am capable of seeing the road, but I cannot march. I propose that you take me on your shoulders and that you carry me, while I show you the road.' Associating themselves in that fashion, the two men could get to their homes ; by means of such a union, they could attain their goal. Returned to their homes, they separated[2]. Even thus, when Spirit has perceived Nature, it attains final Deliverance. When Nature has worked the complete isolation of Spirit, the two separate.

[1] [Cf. Māṭhara : yathā rājā puruṣeṇa saṃyujyate preṣaṇaṃ me kariṣyatī 'ti ; puruṣo 'pi rājñā saṃyujyate vṛttim me dāsyatī 'ti.]

[2] This fable has had a wide success. One finds it among others in the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanhedrim*, fol. 91b), and in the *Gesta Romanorum* (Cowell, *Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha*, 229, note 2).

'*By this means, the world is created.*' Just as a male and a female united together give birth to offspring, even so Spirit and Nature are capable of creating Mahat and the others, by their union. One may ask : 'You have explained that their union produces the world ; in what order is that done ? ' We reply in this verse :

XXII. From Nature arises Mahat, from that the Sentiment of Self, from that successively the sixteen (principles) ; in the sixteen (principles) are the five (subtle elements) ; from these proceed the five gross elements.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*From Nature arises . . .* '. Nature is also called the supreme cause (*pradhāna*), or else *Brahman* or else 'that which comprehends all' (*bahu-dhānaka*).

'*Proceed successively . . .* '. Nature existing by herself is not produced by another thing. Nature first produces Mahat. Mahat is also called Intellect (buddhi) or Intelligence (mati) or Universal Notoriety (khyāti)[1] or Knowledge (jñāna) or Wisdom (prajñā). Where there is Mahat, there is knowledge; that is why one calls it 'Knowledge.' Then, from Mahat proceeds the Sentiment of self ; it is called the Source of the five elements (bhūtādi), or the Modified (vaikṛta), or the Radiant (taijasa). From the Sentiment of self proceed the sixteen principles, that is to say, the five subtle elements (pañca tanmātrāṇi), the five organs of sense (pañca buddhīndriyāṇi), the five organs of action (pañca karmendriyāṇi), and Manas. The five subtle elements are : (1) sound (śabda) ; (2) touch (sparśa) ; (3) form (rūpa) ; (4) taste (rasa) ; (5) odour (gandha). The five categories are but the archetypes or the energies of sound and the others. The five organs of sense are : (1) the ear (śrotra) ; (2) the skin (tvak) ; (3) the eye (cakṣus) ; (4) the tongue (jihvā) ; (5) the nose (ghrāṇa). The five organs of action are : (1) the tongue (vāk) ; (2) the hand (pāṇi) ; (3) the foot (pāda) ; (4) the organ of generation (upastha) ; (5) the anus (pāyu). The sixteen principles proceed from the Sentiment of self. Thus it is said that Mahat, the Sentiment of self and the sixteen principles (proceed from Nature).

'*In the sixteen principles are the five (subtle elements).*' The five subtle elements are among the sixteen principles ; they produce the five gross elements, to wit : (1) the subtle element of sound

[1] '. . . penetrating everywhere, universal.' I am not quite sure that Paramārtha really translates *khyāti* by this word. It may be that he had read *vyāpini* or *vyāpti* in the place of *khyāti*.

produces the gross element of ether (ākāśa); (2) that of touch produces air (vāyu); (3) that of form produces fire (tejas); (4) that of taste produces water (āpaḥ); (5) that of smell produces the earth (pṛthivī). I have already explained that in seeing the three principles, i.e., Nature, the products, and Spirit, one realises final Deliverance.[1] One may ask: 'You have explained that from Nature proceeds Mahat. But what is the characteristic of Mahat?' We reply in these lines:

XXIII. The determinative Intellect, that is Mahat. Virtue, knowledge, absence of passion and power are its characteristics, when it is affected by sattva. *Their opposites (are its characteristics), when it is affected by* tamas.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ

Commentary.

'*The determinative Intellect...*' What is the determinative Intellect? The knowledge that such a thing is an obstacle or that such an object is a man, that is what one calls determinative Intellect, the Mahat. In Mahat, there are eight categories, of which four are endowed with *sattva*, and four with *tamas*. Those endowed with *sattva* are: virtue, knowledge, absence of passion, and power. What are the forms of virtue? They are *yama* (restraint) and *niyama* (obligation). Yama has five sub-divisions: (1) not to put oneself in anger; (2) to respect one's spiritual masters; (3) to possess internal and external purity; (4) to be moderate in eating and drinking; (5) not to become addicted to license. Niyama too is divided into five: (1) not to kill; (2) not to steal; (3) to speak the truth; (4) to practise continence (brahmacaryā); (5) not to flatter. The accomplishment of all these ten things, that is virtue.[2] What is *knowledge?* There are of it two sorts, internal and external. *External knowledge* comprehends the six divisions of the Veda, i.e., the Vedāṅgas: (1) the śikṣā treatise (phonetics); (2) Vyākaraṇa (grammar); (3) kalpa (ritual); (4) jyotiṣa (astronomy); (5) chandas (prosody); (6) nirukta

[1] Cf. Gauḍapāda: vyaktā-'vyakta-jñavijñānān mokṣa iti.

[2] In the enumeration of niyamas, Gauḍapāda follows Patañjali: ahimsā, satya, asteya, brahmacaryā, aparigraha; the yamas are: śauca, samtoṣa, tapas, svādhyāya, īśvara-praṇidhā (adoration of God). The last of the niyamas and all the yamas, save one, differ from the Chinese enumeration, which, however, has greater chances of being the original than that of Gauḍapāda. Above all, the adoration of God is very improbable for the atheistic system of the Sāṁkhya. It may be that Gauḍapāda has adopted the ordinary enumeration of the Yoga school. He expressly cites his source: Pātañjale 'bhihitaḥ. [M. Takakusu has been the victim of a strange confusion, possibly due to a defective copy of Gauḍapāda: ahimsā, satya, etc. constitute yamas, not niyamas, while śauca etc. are niyamas, both according to Patañjali and Gauḍapāda, who but follows the former. Cp. also Māṭhara.]

(etymology). The knowledge of these six subjects is called external knowledge.[1] *Internal knowledge* is that which is produced between the three guṇas and the Spirit. By external knowledge one apprehends the world. By internal knowledge one obtains final Deliverance.—What is absence of passion? There are of it two sorts, one internal and the other external. The *external*: for all that we possess we find difficulties and pain on three occasions: (*a*) when we seek it; (*b*) when we guard it; (*c*) when we lose it. Further, (the fact of possessing) implies two defects: attachment and the (obligation to) injure others. It is in that idea that one becomes a wandering mendicant, renouncing worldly desires. But that form of aversion does not yet produce Deliverance. This degree of absence of passion can be obtained by external knowledge. As for internal absence of passion, we know already that Spirit is different from the three guṇas, and it is for that reason that one makes oneself a monk. We obtain first internal knowledge, and, later, the absence of passion, which leads us to Deliverance. External absence of passion leaves us still in *saṃsāra*. It is the internal absence of passion that gives us Deliverance. Power is of eight sorts: (1) to become very minute, to be reduced almost to nothing (aṇimā); (2) to become excessively light, like Manas (laghimā); (3) to expand oneself throughout the atmosphere (mahimā); (4) to obtain easily what one desires (prāpti); (5) to be the supreme Lord of the three worlds, superior to all (īśitva); (6) to enjoy immediately all that one desires (prākāmyam); (7) not to depend on another, to be capable of making the beings of the three worlds to come, and to make oneself served by them (vaśitvam); (8) to live where one wills, that is to say, to be capable of living as one wills, it does not matter at what moment or at what place (yatrakāmāvasāyitvam).[2]

The four categories (virtue, knowledge, absence of passion, and power) are the characteristics of *sattva*. When *sattva* predominates, it is capable of hiding *rajas* and *tamas*; then, Spirit is joyous, and enjoys the faculties (virtue, etc.), which are the marks of *sattva*.

[1] Gauḍapāda adds: purāṇa, nyāya, mīmāṃsā, dharmaśāstra.

[2] Though saying that there are eight categories, Gauḍapāda enumerates nine of them. Wilson does not seem to have perceived it. I think that *garimā* has been added by error or as a synonym of *mahimā*, because this word is not explained lower down. The *Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudī* reads: *yac ca* kāmāvasāyitvam in the place of *yatra*.

[It should be noted that at least one edition of Gauḍapāda (Benares, Chowkhamba Press) omits garimā and enumerates only eight. Māṭhara, on the contrary, includes garimā and seems to mention nine. It is possible, however, that on his enumeration too there are only eight, for, yatrakāmāvasāyitvam may mean (as Vācaspati understands it) satya-saṁkalpatā, and be thus practically synonymous with vaśitvam (though Vācaspati himself takes the two as distinct, and omits garimā from his list). The list of lordly powers varies thus with different commentators, in some details.]

Their opposites are the characteristics of *tamas*. These are: (1) vice; (2) ignorance; (3) passion; (4) infirmity. These four categories are the marks of *tamas*. When one adds to the four categories affected by *sattva* the four affected by *tamas*, one has eight divisions in Mahat. When they evolve, each one proceeds from a preceding one.

One may ask: 'You have explained the characteristics of Intellect. What are those of the Sentiment of self?' We reply in this verse:

XXIV. The Sentiment of self, it is the sentiment that such a thing pertains to me. From that proceed two sorts (of products): in the first place, the eleven organs, and in the second place, the five subtle elements and the five gross elements.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ

Commentary.

'*The Sentiment of self...*' What are the characteristics of the Sentiment of self? 'This voice is mine, this touch is mine, this form, this taste, this odour are mine, this religious merit is mine and is agreeable to me': similar conceptions are called the Sentiment of self.

'*From that proceed two sorts...*', that is to say, from the Sentiment of self two sorts of products proceed. What are they?

'*In the first place, the eleven organs...*' The eleven organs and the five subtle elements have been explained higher up (v. XXII).

The definition of the Sentiment of self has just been given. The Sentiment of self is divided into three parts. What does each of them produce? We reply in this verse:

XXV. The eleven organs endowed with sattva *are produced by the Sentiment of self, in so far as [it is]* Modified ; *the Sentiment of self, in so far as [it is]* the Source of the elements, *produces the five subtle elements endowed with* tamas ; *in so far as [it is]* Radiant *it produces the two sorts.*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The eleven organs . . .*' When *sattva* predominates in the Intellect, the Sentiment of self proceeds from it, and *rajas* and *tamas* remain hidden. The Sentiment of self endowed with *sattva* is called by the Sages the 'Modified' (*vaikṛta*). It is the modified Sentiment of self which produces the eleven organs. How can that be? Because, when *sattva* predominates, it is capable of conceiving (*word for word:*

holding) its appropriate objects, to become lightening, illuminating, purifying. That is why the eleven organs produced by it are called 'endowed with *sattva*' (*sāttvika*).

'*In so far as* [*it is*] *the Source of the elements* . . .' If *tamas* predominates in the Intellect, then the Sentiment of self is produced, *sattva* and *rajas* remaining hidden. As the Sentiment of self is endowed with *tamas*, it is called by the Sages the 'Source of the elements' (*bhūtādi*). It is this Sentiment of self which produces the five subtle elements; that is why the five subtle elements and the five gross elements are endowed with *tamas*.

'*In so far as* [*it is*] *Radiant* . . .' If *rajas* predominates in the Intellect, the Sentiment of self proceeds from it, *sattva* and *tamas* remaining hidden. This Sentiment of self is endowed with *rajas*. That is why the Sages call it the 'Radiant' (*taijasa*). This Sentiment of self produces the two sorts, that is to say, the eleven organs, and the five subtle elements, etc. In producing these organs, the modified Sentiment of self, endowed with *sattva*, has for concomitant, the 'Radiant.' How is that? Because, the 'Radiant' is active, while the 'Modified' Sentiment of self, endowed with *sattva* is inactive. That is why the Sentiment of self, when it produces the eleven organs, is necessarily accompanied by the 'Radiant.' The 'Source of the elements' too, in producing the five subtle elements, has necessarily the 'Radiant' for concomitant. How is that? Because, the Sentiment of self endowed with *tamas* is passive, while the 'Radiant' is active. Thus, the Radiant Sentiment' of self is capable of producing the eleven organs (on the one hand) and the five subtle elements (on the other). That is why one says that the 'Radiant' makes the two sorts originate.

One may ask: 'You have explained that the Sentiment of self, endowed with *sattva*, produces the eleven organs. But what are they?' We reply by these lines:

XXVI. The ears, the skin, the eyes, the tongue and the nose are called the five organs of sense; the tongue [*speech*], *the hands, the feet, the organ of generation and the anus are the five organs of action.*

Sanskrit Kārikā.

Commentary.

'*The ears, the skin* . . .' (these organs), why are they called 'organs of sense'? They can perceive sound, form, etc; that is why they are called 'organs of sense.'

'*The tongue* (*speech*), *the hands, the feet* . . .' Because these five organs are the instruments of action, the sages of antiquity have called them the five 'organs of action.'

One will ask: 'How do these ten organs discharge their respective functions?' The organ of hearing proceeds from the subtle element of sound, and is related in its nature to the gross element, ether; it perceives, then, sounds alone. The organ of touch (the skin) proceeds from the subtle element of touch, and is related in its nature to the gross element, air; it perceives, then, contact alone. Even so, the eyes are produced by subtle form, and are related in their nature to the five gross elements; they perceive, then, forms alone. The tongue comes from the subtle element of taste; it is related in its nature to water, and perceives savour alone. The nose comes from the subtle element of odour, and is related to the gross element, earth; it perceives, then, odours alone. The five organs of action have five functions. The organ of speech, combined with the organs of sense, is capable of articulating names, phrases, and letters (of the alphabet). The hands, combined with the organs of sense, are capable of taking, holding, etc., or accomplishing any mechanical action whatsoever. The feet, united to the organs of sense, can march together on a road, ascending or descending. The organ of generation, united to the organs of sense can procure (sensual) pleasure, and give birth to children. The anus, united to the organs of sense, can evacuate excrement. That is why one speaks of 'the ten organs.'

One may ask: 'What is the Manas?' We reply in this verse:

XXVII. Manas *is that which discerns. One says that that organ is of two sorts: it is modified according to the variations of the three guṇas (on the one hand) and according to external differences (on the other hand).*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Manas is that which discerns.*' This organ passes as being of two sorts; discernment is its nature. How can it be thus? Manas is called an organ of sense, when it unites itself with the organs of sense; but it is called an organ of action, when it unites itself with the organs of action; for, the Manas is capable of discerning the functions of the two classes of organs. It is in the same manner that a man can pass for an artisan or an orator at the same time. Why does one call it an organ? Because it resembles the ten other organs. The ten organs are produced by the 'Modified' [*vaikṛta*] Sentiment of self; even so the Manas. Its function is the same as theirs, for what they do, the Manas does that too. That is why one calls it an organ.—One may ask: 'The actions of the organs differ from one another. The organ, Manas, has it a special function?' Reply: 'Discernment is

its function. Imagine that a man apprehends that in a certain place there is treasure or food; he takes the resolution to proceed to that place, in order to obtain an excellent repast and riches. Such discernments or judgments are the special function of Manas. As it resembles thus the ten other organs in its mode of production [and] in its function, and because it possesses a special faculty, to wit, discernment, Manas is considered an organ. That is why one reckons eleven organs '.—One may ask: 'What is the agent productive of them all? If you wish to know why I have this doubt, I will tell you that I have put that question to you, because the opinions of sages differ on that. Some attribute actions to Spirit, others to the Lord (Īśvara) or to a material being. Opinions differing thus, each from the rest, I have had this doubt. The eleven organs ought certainly to be produced by a conscious (cause). Why? Because, the eleven organs are capable of seizing the eleven objects; but Nature, Mahat and the Sentiment of self are unconscious, and cannot have such a capacity (of production). This verse is found in the work of the Lokāyatas: 'What produces the white colour of the haṃsas, the green colour of the parrots, and the variegated colour of the peacocks, it is from that that I too am created '.[1] I have, then, uncertainty on the origin of the eleven organs'. I reply: 'As for the opinion that you have just mentioned, neither Spirit nor Īśvara is the productive agent; nor is there a special dharma, which may be called "Being". Then, nothing that you have just indicated can produce the eleven organs. What, then, is their origin?'

'*It is modified according to the variations of the three guṇas (on the one hand) and according to external differences (on the other hand)*'. The three guṇas, in company with the Sentiment of self, develop the eleven organs, according to the will of Spirit.[2] What is the will of Spirit? The objects of the organs are not identical, each with the rest; by these eleven organs, one can apprehend their (eleven) respective objects, for, a single organ cannot apprehend them all at the same time. There is the reason for the difference of the eleven organs. You imagine further that something unconscious cannot produce different things; but that is not correct, for, we see that an unconscious thing can be endowed with several faculties. That will be explained further on in this treatise (v. LVII): 'It is to nourish the calf that milk comes from the unconscious cow; in the same fashion, it is to deliver Spirit that the unconscious produces the

[1] This verse, extracted from a treatise of the Lokāyatas, recurs in the commentary on v. LXI, with an insignificant difference. In his v. LXI, Gauḍapāda has an expression, which certainly forms part of our verse:

kena śuklīkṛtā hamsā mayūrāḥ kena citritāḥ.

[2] . . . It may be that one ought to translate—'of their own will'. [This might have made better sense.]

organs'. That is why the three guṇas, though being unconscious, can produce the eleven organs.—One will ask: 'We know now that the eleven organs proceed from the Sentiment of self, but the place of each differs. Who has made them thus? For example, the eyes, placed above, are capable of seeing a form at a distance. The ears, placed one on each side, are capable of hearing a sound from a-far. The nose, situated by itself [prominently ?] is capable of sensing an odour that approaches it. The tongue, in the mouth, receives the taste that approaches it. The skin of the body senses all that touches it. Further, the tongue, placed in the mouth, can articulate names, phrases and letters (*vyañjana*). The hands, at the left and at the right, manipulate objects. The feet, at the lower extremity, march forwards or backwards. The two other organs are hidden to view, so that no one may see them. They effect excretion and pleasure. The (eleventh) organ, the Manas, has no definite place, and is capable of discernment. Who has arranged all this in this manner? Is it Spirit or Īśvara or a Special Being?' Reply: 'Neither Spirit nor Īśvara is the cause thereof. The true cause, it is Nature.' Nature produces the three guṇas, and the Sentiment of self, which, in its turn, evolves, according to the will of Spirit (or else: according to its own will; see note on the last page). It is by the three guṇas that the different organs receive their respective places. That is why one says that the Manas '*is modified according to the variations of the three guṇas, and according to external differences*'. Among the organs, there are those, which apprehend objects close by, while others perceive things from a-far. Their object is double; (1) to avoid danger; (2) to protect the body. 'To avoid danger' (relates to the eyes and ears, which) in seeing and hearing from a-far, avoid the danger. 'To protect the body' (relates to the eight other organs, which) perceive the eight species of objects, from each of the objects approaching the corresponding organ; that permits us to regulate our body, according to these objects.—One may ask: 'What do these eleven organs do?'. We reply in this verse:

XXVIII. The function of the five organs of perception is uniquely to perceive objects, colours, etc.; to speak, hold, march, enjoy, evacuate, those are the functions of the five organs of action.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Uniquely to perceive objects* ...' The eyes act only to see forms, and that is the function of the eyes. It is only a perception incapable of discernment or handling. The other organs too act only on their respective objects. The organs of perception illumine the objects,

while the organs of action utilise them. We have explained the functions of the intellectual organs, and we proceed to the organs of action. To speak is the function of the tongue, to handle that of the hands, to march that of the feet, to generate and effect pleasure that of the organ of generation, to evacuate that of the anus. We have explained the functions of the organs of action. We shall pass on to the objects (*viṣaya*), and the functions (*vṛtti*) of Mahat (the Intellect), of the Sentiment of self, and of the Manas.

XXIX. The three (principles) have their characteristics for [their] functions. The sphere (of activity), is not the same for the thirteen (organs). The functions common to all the organs are the five vital airs, prāṇa *and the others.*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The three (principles) have for functions. . . .*' Determinative knowledge is characteristic of the Mahat; that characteristic is at the same time its function. The consideration of self is the characteristic of the Sentiment of self, and is at the same time its function. Discernment is the characteristic and the function of the Manas.

'*The sphere of activity is not the same for the thirteen (organs)*'. The ten (external) organs have different spheres of action; and the three (internal) organs, the Mahat, the Sentiment of self, and the Manas, have for characteristics their functions. That is why it is said that the sphere of action is not the same (for all).

'*The functions common to all the organs . . .*' When the function special to each organ manifests itself, we know that there ought to be a function common to all. The functions special to each organ are similar to the wife of a man, while the function common to all is similar to a woman-servant, who has many masters. What is that common function?

'*The five vital airs . . .*' (1) prāṇa,[1] (2) apāna,[2] (3) udāna,[3] (4) vyāna,[4] (5) samāna;[5] their functions are common to all the organs. *Prāṇa* draws the external object (air) through the passage of the mouth and the nostrils; that is its function. The statement: 'I hold myself erect, I walk' is the function of this vital air. By

[1] . . . *po-na,* 'respiration, ordinary inspiration and expiration.'
[2] . . . *a-po-na,* 'the descending air, the air which acts in the lower parts.'
[3] . . . *yeou-t'o-na,* 'the ascending air, the vital air which causes the pulsation of the arteries, from the navel up to the head.'
[4] . . . *p'o-na,* 'the air which diffuses itself, by which the divisions and internal diffusions are accomplished.'
[5] . . . *so-mo-na,* 'the collecting air, which conducts and distributes nourishment etc., equally through the body.'

which organ is it governed? It is a function common to all the thirteen organs. Thus, a bird, which bestirs itself in a cage, moves the cage; even so, when the air, prāṇa, bestirs itself, the thirteen organs are put in motion too. There is a function common to all. *Apāna* makes us tremble and flee when we see something which inspires fear. When that air predominates, man becomes timorous. *Udāna* inspires us with pride; thus, when some one climbs a high mountain, he feels that he is superior to others, and that he has an exceptional capacity. When that air predominates, one becomes proud. The assertion: 'I am superior, I am rich' is the function of udāna. *Vyāna* expands in the body, but ends with abandoning the body. When that air predominates, it makes Spirit [the soul?] abandon the body,[1] and feel unhappy. If it goes out gradually, each limb becomes as if dead, and if it quits the body entirely, the man dies. *Samāna*, situated in the heart, is capable of sustaining and controlling the body; that is its function. When that air predominates, man becomes avaricious, and seeks riches and companions (*sic!*). The actions of the five vital airs are the common functions of the thirteen organs.

We have explained the functions, special and general; we pass on to speak of the function entering into action simultaneously and in succession. The verse says:

XXX. The Intellect, the Sentiment of self, the Manas and the organs act either simultaneously, or in succession, in regard to visible objects. As for invisible objects, the function of the three (internal organs) acts in succession to (the action of) an (external) organ.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The Intellect, etc., act either simultaneously or in succession, in regard to visible objects*'. As for visible forms, the Mahat, the Sentiment of self and the Manas all act simultaneously to apprehend an object. Even so, the (nine) other organs. The four (activities) acting simultaneously realise an object. '*In succession*'. Let us suppose a man who walks along a road; he perceives an erect object, and doubts if it is a man or a wooden post; but when he sees birds alighting on it, or a liana which enlaces it, or a gazelle which approaches it, he concludes that it is a post; on the contrary, if he sees a robe that stirs itself, or (limbs) contracting or expanding themselves, then

[1] Word for word: 'makes *man* abandon *the other*'. I think that *man* designates here *pumān* or *puruṣa*, and that *the other* designates Nature in the corporeal form.

he knows with certainty that it is a man.[1] Even so, the Intellect, the Sentiment of self, the Manas and the organs act gradually. That is for what is seen by the eyes ; it is the same for what is perceived by the ears and the other organs.

'*As for invisible objects, their function acts in succession to an (external) organ*'. We have explained the successive action of the internal organs, entering into action in the wake of an (external organ), in regard to visible objects. Now, we pass on to treat the same subject, in the case where the question is about invisible objects. It is said in a verse : 'At the end of the *Yuga*, there will be men, who in their error and their perversity, will meditate on the Buddha, the Law and the Community.[2] Themselves perverse, they will gain over (to their perverse ideas) their relatives, their friends and their acquaintances. Themselves opening the road to the four evil ways (durgati : apāya), they will enter therein with the others.' As the past, so the future. By the organ of hearing, the three categories (Intellect, Sentiment of self and Manas) enter into action one after another. Thus, their function enters into action, in succession to an external organ.—One may ask : 'These thirteen organs are unconscious, and if they do not depend on Spirit or Īśvara, how can they apprehend their respective objects ? ' We reply in this verse :

XXXI. The thirteen organs are capable of acquitting themselves of their appropriate functions, without being put in action by another thing.[3] *The will of Spirit is the cause ; there is not any other instigator.*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The thirteen organs are capable of acquitting themselves*'. We have explained higher up that, in our school, neither Spirit nor Īśvara is considered an agent. That is why the thirteen organs acquit themselves of their functions by themselves, according to their respective spheres of action, without being put in action by another thing. A brāhmin engaged in brahmacaryā apprehends that in a certain place there is a master of the Vedas who is ready to teach, and [who is] surrounded by disciples who study under him, according to their desire ; he decides that he will go to study under him. That

[1] The example of the man and the post will appear again under v. XLVI. *Cf.* Alberuni, I, 84, and Garbe, *Sāṁkhyaphilosophie*, p. 65. See higher up, in the Introduction, my discussion of the parables employed in this text.

[2] The mention of the Ratnatrayam is curious ; the Japanese commentators say that this verse is not Buddhistic.

[3] Paramārtha seems to have ill understood *parasparākūta* 'mutual impulsion'. He says just the contrary.

determinate knowledge is the function of the Mahat. The Sentiment of self, seizing the intention of the Mahat, thinks thus : 'I go to provide myself with all the school-equipment that a brāhmin student ought to possess, so that my soul may not be distracted'. The Manas accepts the will of the Sentiment of self, and discusses thus : 'What Veda shall I study first : Shall I study the Sāma-Veda or the Yajur-Veda or the Ṛg-Veda ?' The external organs, seizing the determination of the Manas, acquit themselves of their respective functions, that is to say, the eye sees the road, the ear hears the others talk, the hand holds the water-pot, and the feet march. Thus, a chief of brigands gives an order and says : 'To go or to come, for you to advance or for you to stop, you ought to obey my command'; and the troop of brigands obeys his orders. It is the same with the organs. The Intellect resembles the chief of the brigands, and the other organs, similar to the band of brigands, know the intentions of the Intellect, and acquit themselves of their appropriate functions.— One may ask : 'Each one of the thirteen organs seizes the objects which present themselves before it. Does it do this for itself or for another ?' Reply :

'*The will of Spirit is the cause ; there is not any other instigator*'. This has been already explained (v. XXI). The affairs of the Spirit ought to be executed and it is for that that the three guṇas produce the organs, which seize the different objects in such a manner as to manifest (the will) of Spirit. But where do you find an agent, if you assert that all the organs are unconscious ? There is no agent, besides Īśvara, who can come in their midst to make them act. There are only Spirit and Nature, which unite themselves to operate together. Spirit has this will : 'You have to manifest yourself, and find for me a solitary existence'. To obey this will of Spirit, the three guṇas produce all the organs. It is in accord with the will of Spirit that each one acquits itself of its appropriate function ; besides the will of Spirit, there is not any other instigator.—One may ask : 'Among the twenty-four principles, how many can be called organs ?' We reply in this verse :

XXXII. The organs are to the number of thirteen, and are capable of drawing, holding, manifesting. The effect is of ten kinds : It is what is to be drawn, held, manifested.

Sānskrit Kārikā.

Commentary .

'*The organs are to the number of thirteen*'. The 'organs' of which there is often question in this treatise are of thirteen kinds alone. They are the five organs of sense, the five organs of action,

and the three internal organs—the Intellect, the Sentiment of self, and the Manas. What functions pertain to the thirteen organs? They are capable of *drawing*, *holding*, *and manifesting*.

'*The effect is of ten kinds*'... The five objects, sound and the rest, and the five actions, speech and the rest, those are the ten effects to produce. They are divided into three classes: (1) what [there] is to draw; (2) what [there] is to manifest; (3) what [there] is to hold. Among the thirteen organs, it is to the internal organs that what there is to draw belongs, to the five senses that what there is to manifest belongs, and to the five organs of action that what there is to hold belongs[1] and it is because they have this triple effect that one calls them the 'thirteen organs'. Thus (the effect) is said to be of three kinds: what is to be drawn, what is to be held, and what is to be manifested.—One may ask: 'How many organs seize objects of the three times (past, present, future), and how many seize objects of the present alone?' We reply by this verse:

XXXIII. The internal organs are to the number three; the ten external organs are their objects. The external organs seize the objects of the time present, while the internal organs seize the objects of the three times.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The interml organs are to the number three*'. The Intellect, the Sentiment of self, and the Manas are called the 'internal organs'. They do not act directly on external objects, and, for that reason, one calls them 'internal'. They are the means by which the will of Spirit is executed, and it is for that one calls them 'organs'.

'*The ten external organs*'. The ten external organs are the five senses and the five organs of action. They are capable of seizing external objects directly: that is why one calls them 'external organs'.

'*Their objects*'. The ten (external) organs are considered the objects of the Intellect, the Sentiment of self, and the Manas. Just as a master makes his servants work, even so, the three (internal) organs employ the ten external organs.

'*The external organs seize the objects of the time present*'. The ten external organs have for objects the things of the time present.

[1] This repartition differs from that of Gauḍapāda, who assigns the *āharaṇa* and the *dhāraṇa* to the organs of action, and the *prakāśa* to the senses.

How do you know that? The ears seize only the present sounds, without hearing those of the past or the future. As the ears, so the nose and the others. The organ of speech, the tongue, is capable of speaking the actual language, which consists of words, phrases and letters, but it cannot articulate that of the past or the future. As the tongue, so the other four (organs of action).

'*The internal organs seize the objects of the three times.*' The Intellect, the Sentiment of self and the Manas act on objects of the three times. The Intellect realises a pot of water [that is] present; it realises in the same way an object of the past; for example, it represents to itself the kings of antiquity, Mūrdhāta [1] and the others. It realises, further, the future, for example, when it thinks: 'All men will perish'. So also is the Sentiment of self; it acts on the objects of the three times, saying: 'This is mine'. So also the Manas; it seizes the objects of the three times, that is to say, it looks in advance on the future and recalls the days past. That is why one says that the internal organs seize the objects of the three times.— 'How many organs seize specific objects and how many seize non-specific objects?' We reply in these lines:

XXXIV. Among the thirteen organs, the intellectual organs seize objects, specific and non-specific. The tongue (as organ of speech) has sounds alone as object; the four other (organs) act on the five objects.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Among the thirteen (organs) the intellectual organs seize. .*' Among the thirteen organs, there are five organs of sense, which are capable of seizing objects, specific and non-specific. 'Specific objects' are those which are endowed with the three guṇas; the 'non-specific objects' are endowed with only one guṇa. Thus, the five objects, sound, touch, form, taste, and odour, such as they exist in heaven, are non-specific, being equally endowed with *sattva*, and free from *rajas* and *tamas*. The five objects of the world of men are specific, being endowed with all the guṇas, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, and produced by the co-operation of these guṇas. The intellectual organs of all the celestial beings seize non-specific objects, but those of human beings apprehend specific objects. Thus, it is said that they *seize objects, specific and non-specific.*

[1] . . . . 'the king born out of the top of the head'. His other name was Māndhāta (. . . Man-t'o-to). A Japanese commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* says that he was also called . . . P'ou-cha-t'o, but that is the name of his father: Upoṣada. Cf. *Divyāvadāna*, p. 210.

'*The tongue has sounds alone as object*' The tongue, divine or human, has sounds alone as objects; it is capable of articulating sounds, phrases and letters.

'*The four other organs act on the five objects*'. The hand, which is composed of the five objects, is capable of seizing the five objects, as when it seizes a water-bowl. As the hand, so the other organs (of action). These four organs being thus constituted by the five objects seize all the five objects.—There are still some other characteristics. We explain them in this verse :

XXXV. The Intellect (co-operating) with the (other) internal organs seizes all the objects. That is why the three (internal) organs master the gates, the (ten external) organs being the gates.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The Intellect . . . seizes all the objects*'. The Intellect operates always in concert with the Sentiment of self and the Manas; that is why it is said: '*the Intellect, with the other internal organs*'. It is thus capable of seizing the objects of the three regions (earth, sky, space), and of the three times; that is why it is said: '*it seizes all the objects*'.

'*That is why the three internal organs master the gates*'. The three organs, Intellect and the others, make themselves masters of all the gates. If the three co-operate with the organ of sight, the eye renders forms manifest, the other organs remaining inactive. The three unite themselves with an organ, and seize the objects of the three regions and of the three times; that is why it is said that they govern the ten organs.

'*The ten external organs being the gates*'. This means that the five senses and the five organs of action are opened or closed, according to the (will of) the three internal organs. If these are found in the eye, the gate of sight is open in such a fashion as to see objects before it; but the other gates are closed and can perceive nothing. Since they obey the others, the ten external organs are only gates, and not real organs. Thus the ten (external) organs co-operating with the three internal organs can perceive all the objects of the three worlds. Another verse says :

XXXVI. The organs are similar to a lamp; differing each from the rest, according to the gunas, they illumine the objects of the three worlds, and transmit them to the Intellect, for the use of Spirit.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The organs are similar to a lamp*'. This means that the five senses, the five organs of action, the Sentiment of self and the Manas are similar to a lamp, which, remaining in a single place, equally illumines all objects. All these organs are capable of illuminating the objects of the three worlds; that is why it is said '*like a lamp*'.

'*Differing, each from the rest, according to the guṇas*'. They are not similar, each to the rest; the ear seizes sound, but not form; the eye seizes form, but not sound . . . the nose seizes odour alone, but not taste. Thus, the five organs of sense necessarily occupy themselves with different objects; that is why it is said that they 'differ, each from the rest'. It is the same with the organs of action; the tongue articulates words alone, but is not capable of any other function, etc. Even so, the Intellect does but conclude; the Sentiment of self forms only egoistic concepts; the Manas does but discern. That is why it is said that they differ 'each from the rest.' What is the meaning of 'difference'? The Sentiment of self is not similar [as] produced with [each of] the three guṇas. The five subtle elements and all the organs produced by the Sentiment of self are not similar. (There is the difference).

'*They illumine the objects of the three worlds and transmit them to the Intellect for the use of Spirit.*' The twelve[1] organs illumine the objects of the three worlds, which are all different, and transmit them to the individual. In the same way as the functionaries and the people of the realm transmit riches to the king,[2] so the twelve organs bring over all the objects to the Intellect, and the Intellect makes them seen by Spirit.—It is said '*for the use of Spirit*'. One may ask: 'Why do the organs, having illumined the objects, not themselves make them seen by Spirit?' The reply is in this verse:

XXXVII. The Intellect prepares all that Spirit enjoys, and, further, it makes it see later the subtle difference between Nature and Spirit.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The Intellect prepares all that Spirit enjoys . . .*' The enjoyment or the activity of Spirit is not the same throughout. The enjoyment of the ten objects . . . and that of the eight powers differs according to

[1] All the texts, except the Corean, have 'thirteen' here, faultily.

[2] Vijñāna Bhikṣu gives a similar example (*Sāṁkhyapravacana-Bhāṣya* II, 47).

place, be it in the human world, be it in heaven, be it among the animals. The ten external organs, that is to say, the five senses and the organs of action, render objects manifest and transmit them to the Intellect; the Intellect receives them to give them to Spirit, to the end that it may enjoy them. By that transmission, the Intellect makes Spirit enjoy (the objects) to its satisfaction and experiences pleasure therefrom, so long as it has not attained supreme knowledge.

'*Further it makes it see later the subtle difference . . .*' 'Later' means: 'When the supreme knowledge is born in it'. There is a distinction between Spirit and Nature, but this distinction cannot be seen by men who have not given themselves to saintly practices, and that is why one calls it 'subtle'. In so far as [it is] the 'gate-way' of this distinction, the Intellect alone, among the thirteen organs, can make it seen by Spirit. What is it to 'see'? The concern is to know that Spirit differs from Nature, the three guṇas, the Intellect, the Sentiment of self, the eleven organs, the five subtle elements, the five gross elements and the body. It is the Intellect which teaches Spirit that distinction, and by that Spirit attains final Deliverance, as has been said higher up (v. II): 'He who knows the twenty-five (principles), wherever he may be found, by whatsoever path he may go, whether he have tresses of hair or whether he have only a tuft or whether he have a shaven head, that one is released, without any doubt'. The Intellect alone, then, is the true organ of Spirit.—One may ask: 'Which of the objects are specific and which are not specific? For, you have said in a preceding verse (v. XXXIV) that all organs seize equally objects, specific and non-specific.' We reply in this verse:

XXXVIII. The five subtle elements are non-specific, from them proceed the five gross elements, which are specific, that is to say, tranquil, redoubtable, oppressive.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The five subtle elements are non-specific.*' If you ask the meaning of 'specific' and 'non-specific', we reply: 'From the Sentiment of self proceed the subtle elements, which are pure and tranquil, having *sattva* for the distinctive mark. These are the elementary objects (of perception) [of the gods; they are non-specific, exempt from *rajas* and *tamas*.'

'*From them proceed the five gross elements, which are specific.*' From the subtle element of sound proceeds the ether . . . . and, in the last place, from that of odour proceeds the earth. The five

elements thus produced are specific. What are the characteristics of the specific objects? They are (1) tranquil; (2) redoubtable; (3) oppressive. The five gross elements are the elementary objects (of perception) for men. What are the three characteristics of ether for example? Suppose that a rich man, who comes to taste the five sorts of pleasures in his harem, ascends a high pavilion to look on ethereal space; the element ether will procure him pleasure; then, the ether tranquillises; but suppose that on the high pavilion, he catches a cold; in that case, the ether produces pain (that is to say is redoubtable); suppose, again, a man who marches in a desert and who sees only ethereal space and not a village where he can stop; in that case, the ether oppresses. It is the same with the other elements.

XXXIX. The subtle (bodies), those which are born of a father and mother, and the distinctive gross (elements), that is the triple division (of bodies). Of these three bodies, the subtle is permanent; the other kinds are perishable. [1]

Sanskrit Kārikā.

Commentary.

'*The subtle bodies, those which are born of a father and mother and the distinctive gross (elements), that is the triple division.*' In the three worlds, the subtle body is created first, there are in it only the five subtle elements. The subtle body enters into the womb, where it grows by the mixture of the red and the white (śoṇita-śukra-miśra-bhāvena, 'by the mixture of the blood and the sperm'). The gross body (produced by the parents) grows, being refreshed and nourished by the food and drinks of six tastes,[2] absorbed by the mother. The alimentary channels of the mother and the embryo communicate; it is thus that the latter is nourished. In the same way as the root of a tree has openings to absorb the water which refreshes and nourishes the tree, so the taste of the food and the drink coming through the mother refreshes and nourishes the gross body. The form and the dimensions of the gross body are identical with those of the subtle body. The subtle body is called 'the internal', the gross body 'the external'. In the subtle body, all the characteristics and all the forms of man, the hands, the feet, the head, the face, the back, the abdomen are all present. The ṛṣis express themselves thus in the four Vedas: 'The gross body possesses six substances, three of which, the blood, the flesh, and the nerves (rudhira, māmsa,

[1] (Word for word: 'subject to decrepitude'.)

[2] Ṣaḍrasa; (1) madhura; (2) amla; (3) lavaṇa; (4) kaṭu; (5) tikta; (6) kaṣāya.

snāyu) come from the mother, and three—semen, the hairs, and the bones (śukra; majjā 'marrow'; the Chinese has 'hairs': asthi)—from the father. The body in which these six substances abide is the gross and external body, which develops the subtle internal body. The subtle body, having been developed by the gross body, has the five external elements for abode, as well at the moment of birth as afterwards. Thus, one builds for a royal prince a palace with several halls, and one says to him: 'Here thou wilt live, here thou wilt eat, here thou wilt sleep'. It is the same with Nature, which produces the five gross elements to give an abode to the subtle body and to the gross body: (1) The element ether is produced to serve as a place where no obstacle is encountered; (2) the element earth as a place of rest [abiding]; (3) the element water as the place for purity; (4) the element fire as the place for consumption; (5) the element air as the place for movement and dispersion. There is then in the body the triple division: (1) the subtle body; (2) that which is produced by the parents; (3) (that which results from) the union (of the elements). (The last) is subdivided, after its nature, into three: (1) tranquillising; (2) redoubtable; (3) oppressive.— One may say: 'Among these three categories, which are permanent, which are not that?' We reply:

'Of these three (bodies), the subtle is permanent, the others are perishable'. Among the three bodies, the subtle kind, which is formed by the five subtle elements, is the source of the body. When the gross body perishes the subtle body, if it is accompanied by vice (adharma), is reborn among one of the four classes: (1) quadrupeds; (2) winged beings; (3) serpents (that which marches on its chest = *uraga*); (4) beings which have horizontal form (those which march obliquely or sideways = *tiryaṅ*). If it is endowed with virtue (dharma), it is born in one of the four classes: (1) Brahmā; (2) the gods; (3) the master of the world (prajāpati); (4) men.[1] Thus the subtle bodies are permanent, and right until knowledge or aversion (for samsāra) is produced, they migrate through these eight places of birth. But when knowledge or aversion is born, they abandon the (gross) body and attain final Deliverance. That is why it is said that the subtle kind is durable, while the others, the gross kinds, perish and are not durable. At the moment of death, the subtle body abandons the gross body, which, having been produced by the parents, is eaten by the birds, or is abandoned to putrefaction or is consumed by fire. The subtle body of the ignorant turns without cessation in the existences. One may ask:

[1] Ref. the commentary on v. XLIV.

'You say that the body which is produced by the parents perishes; after that, what is the body which migrates through the existences?' We reply in these lines:

XL. The body, in its origin, is without obstruction (and permanent) [1]*; composed of the Mahat, the Sentiment of self and the five subtle elements, it migrates, without acting on the objects. It is influenced by the (mental) states and endowed with the mark of subtlety.*

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*The body in its origin, is without obstruction (and permanent).*' At the commencement, when nature evolves and produces the world, the subtle bodies are created first. From Nature is born the Intellect (Mahat), from the Intellect the Sentiment of self, and from the Sentiment of self the five subtle elements; these seven entities are called 'the subtle bodies'. What is the characteristic of a subtle body? It is similar to the form of the god Brahmā (in its subtlety), and after having perceived the objects (in its numerous existences), it attains final Deliverance. It is 'without obstruction'. The sages have said: 'whether it find itself in the world of animals, of men, or of gods, the subtle body does not encounter any obstacle on the part of mountains, rocks, walls, etc., because of its subtlety'. Further, it does not change. So long as it has not attained knowledge, it is never isolated (from the gross body); that is why one says that is durable.

'*Composed of the Mahat, the Sentiment of self, and the five subtle elements*'. Of how many substances is the subtle body composed? Of seven subtle substances. But as for the sixteen gross substances (the five gross elements and the eleven organs), what function does the subtle body exercise over them?

'*It migrates. . . .*'. The subtle body associated with the eleven organs migrates through the three regions, assuming one of the four births (of each species, of which there are two; see v. *XXXIX*).

'*Without acting on the objects.*' If it is separated from the eleven organs or the gross body produced by the parents, it is not capable of seizing the objects (to enjoy them).

'*It is influenced by the mental states and endowed with the mark of subtlety.*' The subtle body is influenced by the three states of being. The three states of being are explained lower down (v. *XLIII*). They are: (1) the state acquired by goodness; (2) the state obtained

[1] The word corresponding to the Sanskrit *niyatam* (permanent) is not found in the Chinese, but it is necessary to supply it, in accordance with the Commentary.

by Nature; (3) the state obtained by a product. These three states of being influence the subtle body.

'*The mark of subtlety.*' The subtle body migrates through the existences and it is what the sages alone see. (That is why one says it has the mark of subtlety.)

One may ask: 'The thirteen organs, in migrating through the existences, why do they assume the subtle body?' We reply in these lines:

XLI. As there is not any painting without a wall; as there is not a shadow without a post or other similar thing; thus, without a body composed of the five subtle elements, the thirteen (gross substances) would have no support.

citraṃ yathā 'śrayaṃ ṛte sthāṇvādibhyo yathā vinā chāyā |
tadvad vināviśeṣair [1] na tiṣṭhati nirāśrayaṃ liṅgam ||

Commentary.

'*As there is not a painting without a wall . . . .*' We see that in this world the support and that which is supported go together and are never separated; thus the colours of a painting have a wall for support, and besides the wall, there is no other support for them. That is why '*the thirteen (gross substances) cannot subsist without the subtle body.*' Thus: without a post (which projects it), there is no support for the shadow; without fire, there is no light, without water no freshness, without air no touch, without ether no space for movement. Thus, without the subtle body, the gross forms have no support and cannot subsist. That is why it is said: '*Without a body composed of the five subtle elements, the thirteen (gross substances) would have no support.*' One may ask: 'With what aid does the subtle body migrate through the existences, in company with the thirteen (gross substances)?' We reply in these lines:

XLII. Having for motive the desire of Spirit, by reason of the cause and the consequence, according to the omnipresent power of Nature, it takes on varied forms (of existence), like an actor.

SANSKRIT KĀRIKĀ.

Commentary.

'*Having for motive the desire of Spirit.*' The desire of Spirit ought to be executed; that is why Nature evolves. This desire is of two sorts: at the commencement, Spirit desires to perceive the

[1] It is necessary to divide: *vinā-aviśeṣair* 'without the non-specific', that is to say, 'without the subtle elements'.

objects etc., and finally it desires to see the distinction between the three guṇas and Spirit. The spirits of the world of Brahmā, etc., can associate themselves with the objects (sound, etc.,) and can later be delivered entirely. Thus Nature evolves and produces the subtle body. Why is the subtle body subjected to transmigration ?

'*By reason of the cause and the consequence.*' The cause is eightfold : virtue, etc., as is explained lower down (v. *XLIII*). It is said in verse *XLIV*: 'By virtue one mounts to heaven, by vice one descends into the lower regions. By knowledge and aversion one gains final Deliverance ; bondage by their contrary.' In what manner are produced the cause and what depends on the cause (the consequence)? Reply :

'*According to the omnipresent power of Nature*'. Like a king who does what he wishes in his domain, Nature causes (the subtle body) to take a form in making it to be born among gods, men and animals. That is why it is said :

'*It takes on varied forms (of existence) like an actor.*' Like an actor who represents now a god, now a king, now a Nāga, now a demon, etc., the subtle body, associated with the thirteen (organs), enters now the womb of an elephant, of a horse, etc., now that of a divinity or of a human being, and becomes an animal, a god or a man.

One may ask : 'You have explained higher up (v. *XL*) that the thirteen organs influenced by the three states of being migrate through the existences. But what are the three states of being ?' We reply in these lines :

(*To be continued.*)

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY

(Text-books, Calendars and Question Papers have been omitted.)

	Name of Publication	Price RS	A	P
1.	**Some South Indian Villages.** by Dr. G. Slater. Available at the Oxford University Press, Madras ... ... each	5	0	0
2.	**Sources of Vizianagar History,** by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar. Available from the Superintendent, Govt. Press, Mount Road, Madras... ... ... each	4	8	0
3.	**Dravidic Studies** (available from the Superintendent, Govt. Press, Mount Road, Madras).			
	Volume I	0	2	0
	Volume II	0	8	0
	Volume III	0	12	0
	Bound Vols. I–III	2	4	0
4.	**History of Sri Vaishnavas,** by Mr. R. Gopinatha Rao	0	10	0
5.	**Psychological Tests of Mental Abilities,** by Dr. A. S. Woodburne	2	8	0
6.	**The Nayaks of Madura,** by Mr. R. Satyanatha Ayyar. Available at the Oxford University Press, Madras	8	0	0

TO BE HAD OF MESSRS.

C. COOMARASWAMI NAIDU & SONS, GEORGE TOWN, MADRAS

	Name of Publication	RS	A	P
7.	**A Study of the Optical Properties of Potassium vapour,** by Dr. A. L. Narayan	1	12	0
8.	**Absorption Spectra and their bearing on the structure of atoms and molecules,** by Dr. A. L. Narayan	0	8	0
9.	**Investigations on the molecular scattering of light,** by Dr. K. K. Ramanathan	1	12	0
10.	**The Kavari, the Mukari and the Sangam Age,** by Mr. T. G. Aravamudan	2	4	0
11.	**Dravidic Studies—No. IV on the Octaval System of Reckoning in India,** by Dr. Mark Collins	0	12	0
12.	**Stone Age in India,** by Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Aiyangar, M.A. ...	1	0	0
13.	**Anatomical and Taxonomic Studies of some Indian fresh and Amphibious Gastropods,** by Mr. H. Srinivasa Rao, M.A., D.SC. ...	1	4	0
14.	**India through the Ages,** by Dr. Jadunath Sirkar, M.A., Ph.D.	1	8	0

साहित्यरत्नाकरकाव्यम् ।

(*Continued from Page 49*)

अष्टमः सर्गः ।

दीप्रभानुसुषमासुषमाब्जैर्दीनकन्तुरथकैरथ कैश्चित् ।
वासरै रजनिगौरवचोरैर्धूसरैरजनि चक्रसमीरैः ॥ १ ॥

रूढजातिकलिकावलिकान्तैरूढजालपदलोलपयोजैः ।
जृम्भितार्यमहोभिरहोभिः स्तम्भितातनुयशोभिरशोभि ॥ २ ॥

भास्करस्य चिरमातपभूम्ना बाधिता शिशिरता सरसीषु ।
आसदत्पदमदःप्रमदानां स्नावनाय किमु वारिजिनीनाम् ॥ ३ ॥

हेलिना सरसि हेतिनिपातैरम्बुजानि दलितान्यवलोक्य ।
आक्षिपन्ति वनिताक्षिविलासं कर्दमे झषगणो नु निलिल्ये ॥ ४ ॥

शीतमात्मनि चिरेण विधेयं हारपङ्क्तिरहितादहिमांशोः ।
आतपादवितुमत्र सहायानाश्रयत्किमु कुचानबलानाम् ॥ ५ ॥

उत्तरीयवसनान्युदवाक्षुर्योषितः कुचयुगेषु मृदूनि ।
आश्रितानि तुहिनान्यहिमांशोः शीततामिव चिरेण दरेण ॥ ६ ॥

अर्यमापि निजमातपतापं हन्त सोढुमपटुः सरसीषु ।
अब्जगर्भनिहिताङ्घ्रि कथंचिद्दीर्घदीर्घमनयद्दिवसानि ॥ ७ ॥

आतपस्तनुमतामहिमांशोः स्वैरचङ्क्रमसहो न दिवेति ।
विस्मयाय न विहारमवन्यामातनोद्यदतनोरपि भग्नम् ॥ ८ ॥

अक्षि मध्यममपि व्यतनोन्मामङ्गहीनमधुना पुरजेतुः ।
दक्षिणं तदतिरूक्षमितीव वस्तुरन्तरदधादसमेषुः ॥ ९ ॥

सर्वतोमुखसरन्मृगतृष्णावीचिकाकृतविडम्बनखिन्नाः ।
संकुचत्सलिलगात्रमकुर्वन्नापगा गतिमपत्रपयेव ॥ १० ॥

शैत्यमात्मरिपुमादधतीनां स्वास्पदेषु रविरम्बुजिनीनाम् ।
जीवनानि कमितात्यपजह्रे स्थान एव हि तदेतदिनस्य ॥ ११ ॥
आत्मजीवनहृतोऽप्यहिमांशोरन्तराश्रितमवाप्य सरांसि ।
शैत्यमप्रतिहतं समरक्षन्कीर्त्तिरेषु किमदृश्यत तेन ॥ १२ ॥
अर्यमा भुवि जलान्यपहृत्य क्वाथितानि सरसां करजालैः ।
हन्त घर्मसलिलान्यपदिश्य व्याकिरन्पथि वपुःषु जनानाम् ॥ १३ ॥
कर्णशेखरशिरीषमधूलीरक्षिता मधुलिहो रमणीनाम् ।
गल्लकोल्लसितघर्मपोहन्पक्षजातपवनेन कृतज्ञाः ॥ १४ ॥
जाग्रति स्फुटजपास्तबकानां कैतवेन खरहेतिमयूखाः ।
मार्गितुं वनमहीष्विति गर्ते तन्नमास्त नु लुलायतमिस्रम् ॥ १५ ॥
अक्ष्णि कालभिषगातपरीक्ष्यात्पाटले सति परं वनलक्ष्म्याः ।
भ्रम्मराञ्जनमलिम्पत माध्वीबाष्पवृष्टिरुदिता बहुधा यत् ॥ १६ ॥
जीवितेश्वरगुरुः प्रभुरीर्ष्याज्जीवनानि जगतां हरतीति ।
अस्फुटत्क्षितिरलक्ष्यत न द्यौरात्मभूः क्वचिदगादनिलोऽपि ॥ १७ ॥
वासराधिपतिना वसुवर्षैस्तन्वतापि भरिताः सकलाशाः ।
दारितं वसुमतीस्थलमौग्र्यादीदृशं हि भुवि शीलमिनस्य ॥ १८ ॥
आतपं प्रबलमंशुमतो भूः सोढुमक्षमतया स्वभवानि ।
चक्रमारुतरयेण रजांसि च्छादकानि किमुदक्षिपदस्य ॥ १९ ॥
स्वातपैर्दिनकरः सरसीनां शोषकस्तपति मामपि रूक्षः ।
इत्यमर्मर्महिरित्र स्म रजोभिः शोषयत्यनिलचोदनकीर्णैः ॥ २० ॥
चक्रमारुतबलेन चलस्य च्छायया तरुगणस्य चकाशे ।
तापिते महितले तपनेन स्थातुमक्षमतयेव लुठन्त्या ॥ २१ ॥
काननेषु विहरन्कपिकच्छूगुच्छकव्यतिकरेण कुतश्चित् ।
मारुतः समधिकामिव कण्डूं मारवे पथि लुठन्परिजह्रे ॥ २२ ॥
आशु गोपयति सादिनि कन्तावव्यवस्थितगतिः किमु वाहः ।
मारवे द्रुतमहिण्डत देशे मण्डलं प्रतिपदोदितरेणुः ॥ २३ ॥

उद्भवद्दवहुताशनधूमैर्व्यादधत्सु तिमिराङ्कुरशङ्काम् ।
अश्रुवान इव गाढममर्षान्विजनोपतिरलक्ष्यत वृक्षः ॥ २४ ॥

आरदुच्चतरुमूलमविक्षत्कुञ्जमध्यभुवमध्यशयिष्ट ।
पल्लवानिति तदा घनदाहं भास्वदाहितमुदास्यत दावः ॥ २५ ॥

अंशुमाननुनिशं वसुदानैरात्मनोऽप्यविषयं बत शीतम् ।
आवहद्वनमदीदहदुव्यामग्निना वसुमतां किमसाध्यम् ॥ २६ ॥

लोकबन्धुरपि लोकमशेषं तापितं निजकरैर्दवभूम्ना ।
अप्यदाहयदशीतमरीचिः किं कृतान्तगुरुताकृतमेतत् ॥ २७ ॥

शीतमन्धतमसैश्चिरमन्तः स्थास्नु दावदहनेन निरस्य ।
द्योमणेः कथयितुं द्युरिदं किं विस्फुलिङ्गवपुषा विजगाहे ॥ २८ ॥

उत्थितं प्रभुरुदस्य वसन्तः किं बलेन शिशिरं कृतकृत्यः ।
दावमात्मशिबिरं दवकीलैर्दीपयन्स्मरसखस्त्यजति स्म ॥ २९ ॥

दावमात्मविततांकुरवृद्धिं मारुतो बत मधौ विदधौ यः ।
दावपावकसखः स्म स घर्मे दृश्यते चपलताफलमेतत् ॥ ३० ॥

आपि नीडमनलैरिति झिल्लीक्रोशनेन मरुदेत्य कुतोऽपि ।
उद्भ्रमंस्तृणमुदक्षिपदस्मादैक्यहेतुरनयोः खगता यत् ॥ ३१ ॥

वीक्षणैरतनुविक्रमसत्तासाधकैरतिशयेन युवानः ।
पर्यरप्सत परस्परदेहस्पर्शरोधिदिनवञ्चनयेव ॥ ३२ ॥

सर्वतोनिपतदम्भसि धारामन्दिरे कुचगिरौ महिलानाम् ।
अञ्चतेव धनिनास्यत घर्मस्तालवृन्तमरुतां तरलेन ॥ ३३ ॥

तापनं बत वतंसितताराजानयो रजनयो जनतापम् ।
काश्चिदुन्मिषितकामसमज्ञास्फूर्तयः समहरन्सुकृतिन्यः ॥ ३४ ॥

वासरैरुपवनीमथ रम्यामेभिरभ्युगतियन्लगृहाढ्याम् ।
स स्म याति रघुनाथनृपालः सस्मयाभिरधिकेलि.वधूभिः ॥ ३५ ॥

अक्षतं शिशिरतां रिपुमेषा रक्षतीति रविणेव नियुक्तम् ।
पाटलीकपटमंशुमलीनां पेटकेन तमसा रुरुधे या ॥ ३६ ॥

पुष्पिणीषु मधुपैर्गणिकासु स्पष्टमेव सरसं रममाणैः ।
आवृतेति नु पलायत यस्याः सत्त्वस्थितिसहो बहिरूष्मा ॥ ३७ ॥
तिर्यगूर्ध्वततशीर्णहिमाम्भःस्फीतयन्त्रनलिकावलिकान्ते ।
ऐन्दवाश्मखचितेऽध्वनि शैत्याद्वैतमप्रतिहतं हि यदीये ॥ ३८ ॥
यत्र नैकजलयन्त्रचतुष्कस्पर्शशीतपवनाङ्कुरभाजि ।
स्पष्टमेव ऋतुरग्रतराकों भाव्यते स्म फलिनैः सहकारैः ॥ ३९ ॥
तापनांशुपरितप्तरसानां खादनेन सहकारफलानाम् ।
वीतकाकु विशदीकृततारं कूजता शुककुलेन युता या ॥ ४० ॥
तादृशीमुपवनीमवनीन्द्रो वारिशीकरवहां जलयन्त्रैः ।
मानिनीभिरभिनन्द्य स कंचिन्माननीयमभजन्मणिसौधम् ॥ ४१ ॥
मन्दिराण्यभिमुखं मणिजालैर्निर्मितानि मणिनिर्मलभित्तौ ।
बिम्बितान्यपि विवेक्तुममुष्मिन्स्पर्शनं मतिमतां प्रबभूव ॥ ४२ ॥
बिम्बितानि मणिभित्तिविभागा मन्दिरस्य निजमध्यजुषोऽस्मिन् ।
नावहङ्गगति नास्त्युपमस्य प्रत्यसृक्षत पराणि तथैव ॥ ४३ ॥
अत्र वज्रमणिभित्तिविभागद्वित्रजालविवराक्रमदम्भात् ।
स्वेच्छया क्वचिदसत्यपि रोधे गच्छति स्म नियतं लघुधूपः ॥ ४४ ॥
भित्तिकल्पितविदूरभवाश्मस्फीतसूत्रवशवर्तिभिरग्रे ।
हंसिकासु बिसखण्डविमोहैर्हासिता युगपदत्र शुकौघाः ॥ ४५ ॥
हंसदत्तबिससूत्रमगृह्णन्भित्तिकासु वलभेदनमण्यः ।
वालवायजशिलावलमानस्वच्छसूत्रवहनस्पृहयेव ॥ ४६ ॥
द्वेषिभिर्विनयतः स्थितघासग्राहितात्र हरिनीलगृहाणाम् ।
चक्षमे न समरेऽस्मदधीना सेयमास सुलभेति विदद्भिः ॥ ४७ ॥
स्वोचिताखिलगुणस्थितिहृद्याप्यत्र नीलमणिवेदिरहासीत् ।
घाससक्तिमखिलेषु समीके खादितेषु भुवि तेषु सपत्नैः ॥ ४८ ॥
स्त्रैणमूरुसदृशो नवरम्भाः स्तम्भपङ्क्तिषु सरोषमबध्नात् ।
ईर्ष्यदोमुखसमैर्मणिपूर्वैरस्यहासि वलभीषु किमत्र ॥ ४९ ॥

कायमानकृतया कलितानां नात्र किं समुचिते नलदानाम् ।
घर्मत्रासरघनार्थमतापच्छेदनादभयसेव्यसमाह्वये ॥ ९० ॥

तत्र सद्मनि ततो नु धरित्रीवृत्रशासनगिरा विपुलाक्ष्यः ।
वारिखेलनवशंवदचित्ताः संघशस्तदुचितं समनह्यन् ॥ ९१ ॥

दीर्घवेणिरुचिराभिरुरोजद्वन्द्वबन्धदृढताप्रसिताभिः ।
शृङ्गवारिहतिधावनसह्यं स्त्रीभिराभृषत काश्चन भूषाः ॥ ९२ ॥

काश्चिदासु नवघौसृणवस्त्रव्याजतो मृगदृशो वसते स्म ।
प्रेयसि प्रणयपेशलभावादन्वहं नवनवाननुरागान् ॥ ९३ ॥

बालिकाः पुनरिदंप्रथमाम्भःकेलिकास्तदनु केवलमध्याः ।
हारहंसकमुखाभरणाढ्या नेह किंचिदपिनेहुरुरोजान् ॥ ९४ ॥

अम्बुखेलनकृते हरिणाक्ष्यः स्वैरमत्र न परं समनह्यन् ।
तर्जितः स्तनरुचा धरणीन्दोः स्थातुमस्य सविधे मदनोऽपि ॥ ९५ ॥

सद्मनः स रघुनाथनरेन्द्रः सज्जितः सलिलनर्म विधातुम् ।
कामिनीभिरुपकण्ठमथायं गाहते स्म सरसः कमनीयम् ॥ ९६ ॥

अम्बुजानि वदनैरभिभूय स्वैस्ततः सरसि तत्प्रतिबिम्बान् ।
बिम्बितैरपि वितेनुरपास्तान्योषितो भवति युक्ततरं तत् ॥ ९७ ॥

अब्जमीनकुवलान्यधिपाथोदुर्गमत्रनयनैस्तुलितानि ।
सुग्रहाणि सुचिरादिति तीरे संमदेन सुदृशः स्म मिलन्ति ॥ ९८ ॥

नावसन्निह नरेन्द्रवधूनां पक्षिणो धुरि परिक्रमचोराः ।
दस्यवो हि भुवि बिभ्यति वित्तस्वामिनोऽप्यविदतः स्वयमेव ॥ ९९ ॥

पङ्कजानि सुदृशां प्रतिबिम्बच्छद्मनात्‌ मुखचारिमचौर्यात् ।
मज्जितानि सलिले महतीति व्यद्रवन्गतिमुषो विहगाश्च ॥ ६० ॥

स्त्रैणगानशतविद्रुतरोधःपद्मरागमणिभागपयोभिः ।
अम्बु घौसृणमगाहत वेगात्पाटलत्वमतिपाटलमत्र ॥ ६१ ॥

हेमयन्त्रपतितैर्हिमतोयैरुद्भ्रमन्ति जलजान्युपरिष्टात् ।
शात्रवं स्म सहजं किमिहैषां व्यञ्जयन्ति भयवेपथुमन्ति ॥ ६२ ॥

गन्धसाररसकर्दमजत्वात्प्राकृतेभ्य इह पङ्करुहाणि ।
सौरभेऽतिशयितानि भुवीति स्वारवैरुदचरन्निव भृङ्गाः ॥ ६३ ॥

वस्तुभिर्भृतमदःप्लवनोचापञ्चषट्पदञ्जवप्रसवाद्यैः ।
वेधसेव निचितैर्विपुलाश्रीसृष्टिकारणगणैश्चिरलब्धैः ॥ ६४ ॥

स्वश्रमापहमुपेत्य सरस्या मारुतार्भकमितो मदिराक्ष्यः ॥
केशसौरभभरेण कृतज्ञाः पुष्टमातनिषत स्फुटमाशु ॥ ६५ ॥

कापि तत्तटपथे कुटिलाक्ष्यः काश्चिदाशु पृथुकाञ्चनकुम्भान् ।
पूरयन्त्यथ पुरा मृगनाभीभावितैर्घुसृणपङ्कपयोभिः ॥ ६६ ॥

हेमयन्त्रनलकैर्मणिशृङ्गैरेष जातुषसमुद्गपुटैश्च ।
कर्तुमारभत घौसृणवारिक्षेपणं युवतिषु क्षितिपालः ॥ ६७ ॥

एतासु कञ्चुकमुपाहतमेकिकायाः शृङ्गात्तघौसृणरसैर्नृपशीतभासा ।
स्वापह्नुतं कुचयुगं समदर्शयद्द्राक्प्रायो न किं तदतिफल्गुगुणेषु युक्तम् ॥
वक्षोजयोरभिहतस्य वनेरुहाक्ष्याः
    कस्याश्चिदीशकरशृङ्गगतोदकस्य ।
संताडयन्ति पृषता स्म सरस्तटस्था-
    न्कोकान्फलं न किमिदं कुचतुल्यतायाः ॥ ६९ ॥

माणिक्यशृङ्गपयसा महिपेरितेन वक्षोरुहौ निरवशेषितपत्रलेखौ ।
कस्याश्चन व्यरुचतामधिकं ततोऽपि कान्तामणेः प्रकटयौवनगौरबिन्दू ॥
भूपोदजातुषपुटाभिहतं परस्याः कर्णोत्पलं न्यपतदम्भसि कम्बुकण्ठ्याः ।
नार्यो मिलन्ति नयनैः कुलमस्मदीयं भङ्क्तुं क्रुधेति वदितुं मृशमुत्पलेभ्यः ॥

भूपेरितं कनकशृङ्गभृतं परस्याः संताड्य वारि कुचयोस्तदनौचितीं द्राक् ।
प्राक्षालयत्किमिदमंशुभरस्य शश्वत्प्रच्छादकेन सह पत्रविलेखनेन ॥ ७२ ॥

अन्या भिया परिजिहीर्षुरभीकशृङ्गवारिप्रहारमबला वलिताननेन्दु ।
पर्यावृतं न परमेनमपि स्म पुष्पैः संताडयत्यनुपदं स्वकचान्तवान्तैः ॥७३॥

छिन्नः परां चरणयोः सुचिरं विमृद्ग-
न्हारो निरुध्य गतिमब्जमुखीं प्रयान्तीम् ।
यन्त्रोदकाहतिशतं यदनेष्ट नेतु-
र्युक्तं हि तद्गुणगणाद्युगपच्च्युतस्य ॥ ७४ ॥

स्रस्तं जवेन चरणौ पथि नह्यमानं
कांचिन्निरुध्य बत काञ्चनकाञ्चिदाम ।
धात्रीपतिं स्वरसितैरनुधावमानं
शृङ्गोदकाहतिकृते स्म चिरं नियुङ्क्ते ॥ ७५ ॥

नाथेन शृङ्गपयसा न किमाहतान्या
वक्षोजयोः स्फुटनवस्वनखव्रणाङ्कम् ।
शृङ्गारभीतिमिलितां श्रयति स्म लज्जां
तामीर्ष्यया तु सह काञ्चन तत्सपत्न्यः ॥ ७६ ॥

एका समेत्य सविधं करयन्त्रवारिसेकासहेव नृपतिं लघु पर्यरब्ध ।
सेऽपि क्षणेन सुतनुं स्वयमङ्गसङ्गात्स्नातामिव व्यधित सान्द्रसुधाझरीभिः ॥

दक्षोऽपरां नृपवरो दयितां सवेगं गृह्णन्निव प्रचलितां स कृशोदरीषु ।
आलिङ्ग्य रोषरहितास्वपि जाग्रतीषु सर्वास्वमन्यत कृतं स्वयमेव साधु ॥

सिक्तोऽखिलाभिरसिताम्बुजलोचनाभिः
सिञ्चन्निमाश्च मणिशृङ्गभृतैः पयोभिः ।
यूथाधिपो बहुकरेणुयुतो यथायं
हर्षात्सरोवरमवातरदुर्वरेशः ॥ ७९ ॥

नाभीबिलैरपहृतोऽपि नतोदरीणा-
मम्भोभरः सरसि नापचितो न चोच्चैः ।
मग्नैः कुचैरजनि हन्त महद्भिरासां
त्रस्तो नु भूरमणदाररिहारयोग्यम् ॥ ८० ॥

मग्नैः कुचैर्गुरुभिरस्य मनस्विनीनामम्भोभरेण नृपतेरभिवर्धितेन ।
स्वान्यम्बुजानि चकितं नु सरो मुखांशुचौर्यादगूहत निमज्जनकैतवेन ॥

द्रोणीविचित्रपटमण्डपधोरणीका भर्मद्रवोल्लिखितलोहपरीतपार्श्वा ।
नीरन्ध्रसंधिफलका निपुणाभिरेका हर्षोत्सरो विधुमुखीभिरनायि तूर्णम् ।

पाण्डित्यनिर्जितफणिप्रभुचोदनेन शाखापुरीं भुवि यथा सरसा स्वपुर्याः ।
अभ्युद्गतामिव समं हरिणेक्षणाभिर्द्रोणीमिमां क्षितितुषारकरोऽध्यरुक्षत ॥

कर्णैररित्रसहितैः कमलेक्षणाभिः काभिश्चन क्षितिशतक्रतुचोदनेन ।
चातुर्यतः सरसि सेयमचाल्यतास्मिन्द्रोणी सलीलमनतिद्रुतमन्दचारम् ॥

क्रीडातरीं सरसि तत्र कृशोदरीभिर्निर्वर्ण्य वर्णयितुमम्भसि नीयमानाम् ।
स्रोतोभिराननभवैः ससुधारसानामारब्ध सादरमसाविति सार्वभौमः ॥ ८५ ॥

आगच्छतीव सरसस्तदमुष्य पारमक्ष्णोरवारमचिरादपसर्पतीव ।
अस्मान्विहारवनमप्यनुधावतीव द्रोणी गतिव्यवसितं सुदृशस्तदेतत् ॥ ८६ ॥

धावन्त्यपि श्रयति नर्म तरी यदेषा
  निष्कम्पतां गतिजवं निगदाम्यमुष्याः ।
अत्यल्पतामिव गतैरधिपारमारा-
  दक्ष्णोः सवेगमगमैरधिकायमानैः ॥ ८७ ॥

बाहायुगेन सरसि प्लवतेऽवलम्ब्य काचिद्व्यलोकयत काञ्चनकुम्भमेषा ।
कोपान्निमज्जयिषतीव कुशेशयाक्षी वक्षोजगौरवमुषं बत वारिगर्भे ॥ ८८ ॥

अन्या निजोरुयुगलेन तदंशुसाम्यगर्वावहं कदलकाण्डमहो विमृद्य ।
अम्भोविहारमधिकेलिसरः सृजन्ती हस्तोपमास्पदरुषा हरते सरोजम् ॥

बाहुद्वयप्लवनवेगभवापरस्याः
  वीचीमुखं निजविरोधि निरस्यतीति ।
आवृत्तवृन्तदलिताब्जनिभेन काचि-
  दम्भोजिनो हसति भीवलितास्यमस्मिन् ॥ ९० ॥

आलम्ब्य हेलकमिहाधितडागमेकं कासांचन प्लुतिजुषां कलभाषिणीनाम् ।
भान्त्याननानि तुहिरुल्लसितानि तानि पाथोजकाननमिव प्रचलस्वभावम् ॥

अम्भोजकैरवमपास्य बहिर्जलान्त-
मङ्क्त्वा झषानपि बलादवमत्य दृग्भ्याम् ।
उज्जृम्भते क्वचन काप्युपजायते य-
द्वर्णैः स्थितिः प्रतिकलं भरितोभयेषाम् ॥ ९२ ॥

वक्त्रेक्षणद्युतिहराण्यपि पङ्कजानि वध्वो वहन्त्यधिशिरो नयनांशुचोरान् ।
अस्मान्परं विकलयन्त्यधुनेति मीनाः प्रष्टुं तदुद्भवमिव प्रविशन्ति पङ्कम् ॥

काचिद्भयादधिसरो गलदच्छमम्भो बाला विहाय समशः प्लवने न शक्ता ।
पद्मानि याचति परां चिरमुत्तरन्तीं तस्या विलोकयत दैन्यमभूतपूर्वम् ॥

पद्माकरो मृगदृशां स परम्परासु पद्मादिमं स्वमखिलं प्रतिपाद्य सद्यः ।
अत्यन्तमुल्लसति हन्त महाशयस्य सर्वस्वदानमपि सांप्रतमेव भूम्नोः ॥९५॥

सरसि विहरणं सरोरुहाक्षीर्विभुरवलोक्य वितन्वतीरतीव ।
व्यहरत रसिकः स्वयं तदानीमयमपि तत्र मुदावतीर्य तर्यीः ॥ ९६ ॥

विहृत्य सरसि क्षमाविभुरयं निजैर्यौवतै-
रवस्त कनकद्रवैरतिविचित्रिते वाससी ।
अभूषयत भूषणैरथ मणीमयैः प्राविश-
त्स सौधमधिकोन्नतं श्रयति च स्म भोगान्बहून् ॥ ९७ ॥

कदापि जलकेलिभिः शिशिरतोयधारागृहैः
कदाचन वधूकुचैरधिकशीतलैरेकदा ।
विशुद्धतरमौक्तिकग्रथितदामभिश्चान्यदा
विभुः स समयं क्षितेरनयदर्यमोत्तेजकम् ॥ ९८ ॥

राघवनयनवनादर माधवनयनक्षमारुहोदार ।
खण्डितवसुधाकण्टक पण्डित वसुधारयाभिषिक्त कवे ॥ ९९ ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपु-
प्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।
कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो
जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥ १०० ॥

श्रीगोविन्दमखीन्दुवंशमणिना श्रीयज्ञनारायणा-
भिख्येनाध्वरिणा कृते मधुसुधारोधाय मेधाविना ।
शान्तानिष्टमदोऽजनिष्ट मधुरः सर्गोऽष्टमश्चोज्ज्वल-
स्तत्राकद्रुदविद्रुदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ १०१ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-
चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्याप्तवाजपेययाजि-
गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-
याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ
साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये
अष्टमः सर्गः ।

नवमः सर्गः ।

अथ कैरवभैरवो नभःपथकैरम्बुमुचां कदम्बकैः ।
ववृचे समयः स्मराद्दतो ववृचेतोहरशाद्वलस्थलः ॥ १ ॥

अवनीपरितापहारिभिर्नवनीपस्तबकोपहारिभिः ।
यवसैकसुहृद्वनीतलैर्दिवसैः किंचिदभावि शीतलैः ॥ २ ॥

अहरं जगतामहं रवेः सचिवः प्राक्सलिलानि पश्चिमः ।
इति तान्यमुनेव मारुतः पुनरुत्सर्जयितुं पुरो ववौ ॥ ३ ॥

जलदैर्मम मार्गरोधकैर्जगदेतत्सकलं निरोत्स्यते ।
इति भीरुरिवाहिमद्युतिस्तनयं दण्डधरं समासदत् ॥ ४ ॥

जलशोषणचातुरीं निजां विभुरह्नां किमु विस्मृतां चिरात् ।
तदिनीशपिबात्तपोधनादधिकर्तुं दिशमाप दक्षिणाम् ॥ ५ ॥

दिशमब्धिपिबेन मौनिना दिनभर्ताधिगतः परिष्कृताम् ।
स्पृशतीति तमङ्घ्रिसंततिं स्तनयित्नौ समकोचयद्ध्रिया ॥ ६ ॥

अवलम्ब्य दिनान्यशोषयद्रविरम्भांसि पुरेति रात्रिषु ।
अकरोदभिवृद्धिमादराददसीयां ध्रुवमम्बुदागमः ॥ ७ ॥

शिथिलेऽप्यचिरांशुभिः कथं फणभृत्प्रग्रहबन्धने रथम् ।
तरसा प्रविचाल्य सारथिस्तरणेर्ह्रासयति स्म वासरान् ॥ ८ ॥

सलिलानि मदर्पितान्ययं सकलान्युप्यपहृत्य दक्षिणाम् ।
अयते दिशमर्यमेत्यगादमुमाक्रष्टुमिवाम्बुदव्रजः ॥ ९ ॥

स्थगितास्थगितौ सरोजिनीविभुचन्द्रौ जलदैर्विरेजतुः ।
स्वपनोन्मुखतां सरस्वति श्रयतः शार्ङ्गभृतो दृशाविव ॥ १० ॥

प्रथमं दिवि पञ्चषैर्घनैस्तपनश्छन्नतनुर्मुहुर्मुहुः ।
समशीलयदम्बुदागमात्स्वतिरोधानकलामिव त्रसन् ॥ ११ ॥

पृषतैर्भुवि पञ्चषैर्यथा प्रियमातन्वत चातकावलेः ।
न तथा जलदाः स्वधारया ननु सर्वेष्वतिरप्रियंकरः ॥ १२ ॥

सलिलद्रुहमाश्रयत्ययं स्वयमब्जोऽपि रविं कदाचन ।
इति रोषवशादिवोडुभिः स्तनयित्नुः शशिनं समावृणोत् ॥ १३ ॥

भुवमातपभूमतापितां शिशिरामम्बुभृतश्चिरं तथा ।
व्यधुरन्वहवृद्धिशालिभिः सलिलै रक्षति सा यथा सहेत् ॥ १४ ॥

अवधीरितमौष्ण्यमावहन्त्यधुना स्त्रैणकुचा इति क्रुधा ।
जलदाः स्म तदाश्रयान्गृहान्स्थगयन्ते लघुधूपकैतवात् ॥ १५ ॥

अधिघर्मदिनान्तमादिमे शयिते विष्टपसद्मनि प्रभौ ।
परितोऽप्यचरन्पयोमुचो निजगर्जानिभघण्टिकारवाः ॥ १६ ॥

चलचन्द्रकनीलकण्ठविस्फुरितं नाट्यविधौ भुवस्तले ।
अवलोक्य बकास्थिमालिका दिवि बभ्राम रुषेव कालिका ॥ १७ ॥

जलदा भुवि चातकद्विजव्रजसंजीवनवैभवोचितम् ।
अवहन्त दिगन्तविस्तृतं बहुशः किं बककैतवं यशः ॥ १८ ॥

सुरनायकचालिते मुहुः स्फुटधारं दिवि वाहने वहन् ।
बकसंततयः प्रकीर्णकव्रजलक्ष्मीमभितश्चलाचलाः ॥ १९ ॥

शशितिग्मरुचौ महौषिकौ समये स्वस्ववशे दिवानिशम् ।
सहसा वृगुतः समुत्थिताविति तावावृत वारिदागमः ॥ २० ॥

अविभक्तमहर्निशं व्यधुर्विधुतादित्यविधुप्रभा घनाः ।
अवनीतलमब्जकैरवैर्विरहय्यापि विभागसूचकैः ॥ २१ ॥

अवधूय रविं तदाश्रयं हरितोऽहान्यपि पद्मिनीर्घनैः ।
अरुधत्समकोचयत्स्वयं पयसामज्जयदम्बुदागमः ॥ २२ ॥

सलिलानि रुषा सरोजिनीरधिगर्भं सरसाममज्जयन् ।
सवितुर्न कदापि शोषकात्स्वपतेः पूर्वममोचयन्निति ॥ २३ ॥

सकलाम्बुजजातिनास्तिके समये मेघनिरुद्धरोदसि ।
सविता बत पाणिनीरजं समरक्षद्धुतयत्नमेककम् ॥ २४ ॥

अरुचन्दिवि विद्युतो घनैररुणस्येव रुचो हठाहृताः ।
निभृतेतरतापदेशतो निजनिर्मोचनकर्मलालसाः ॥ २५ ॥

जलदै रविचन्द्ररोधकैः क्षणदीप्तेरपि मे क्षतिर्भवेत् ।
इति भीतिवशाद्दिवाभवच्चपलानां दिवि चञ्चलं कुलम् ॥ २६ ॥

द्युतयः किमु विद्युतस्त्विषामधिनेतुर्द्रुतमम्बुदैर्वृताः ।
अभितोऽपि चिराय लाघवादधृता बभ्रमुरभ्रसीमनि ॥ २७ ॥

स्वविभावितकेतकीसुमस्तबकामोदहरा वनेष्वित ।
भुवि न स्म सहन्ति विद्युतो भुजगानां क्वचिदप्यवस्थितिम् ॥ २८ ॥

परितापहृतां पयोमुचां प्रवितीर्णाजनि रत्नगर्भया ।
निजकर्णभवन्मणीधनुर्निभतः किं नवरत्नमालिका ॥ २९ ॥

वरटासदृशां वलाहकस्तनितेन द्रवतांससाध्वसम् ।
अपतन्करकापदेशतो भृशमण्डान्यभितो भुवस्तले ॥ ३० ॥

जलदैर्दिवि चन्द्रिकातपौ निबिडौ किं स्थगनैर्निपेततुः ।
स्वघर्षणचूर्णितौ क्षितौ करकावासवकोपकैतवात् ॥ ३१ ॥

समयेन सघर्घरारवं घननीलाश्मघरट्टचूर्णितौ ।
पततः स्म भुवीन्दुभास्करौ करकावासवकोपकैतवात् ॥ ३२ ॥

समयो नटनानि विद्युतां समवेक्ष्याभ्रपथे मणीगणैः ।
मुदितोऽभ्यषिचन्मुहुः क्षितावपतंस्ते हरिकोपरूपतः ॥ ३३ ॥

करकाघुटिकाहतैः शतक्रतुकोदण्डधरो घनागमः ।
निजशात्रवनीरजाश्रयं नियतं हंसकुलं निरास्यत ॥ ३४ ॥

अभितापितमंशुमत्करैरधिघर्मं जगदण्डमम्बुदः ।
सलिलैरसिचत्ततोऽभवत्स्तनितं तत्स्फुटनोद्भवो रवः ॥ ३५ ॥

जलदस्य बभूव गर्जितैर्जगदण्डं श्लथसंधिबन्धनम् ।
अतिवर्षमिषात्तदस्रसन्नवनावावरणाम्भसां भराः ॥ ३६ ॥

निबिडो न परं बहिर्गतं निखिलं व्योम रुरोध नीरदः ।
जनताः श्रुतिगर्भभागपि स्थलधाराहतजातनिस्वनैः ॥ ३७ ॥

तपनोपचितं स्वतापमप्यभिवर्षञ्जलदोऽयमाक्षिपत् ।
इति बाष्पमिलामुचन्न किं सदयाः शत्रुजनेऽपि साधवः ॥ ३८ ॥

अविशत्क्षितिगर्भमब्जिनीपतितापो बहिरक्षमो वसन् ।
इति हन्त रुषेव वारिदाः प्रविहस्तं परुषैरदारयन् ॥ ३९ ॥

निरुपाधि सजीवनं जगन्निखिलं कल्पयतः पयोमुचः ।
असहद्भिरुराहतानि तत्परुषोक्तीरिव पत्युरेकदा ॥ ४० ॥

स्वरसातिशयेन संकुचत्समनिम्नोन्नतबोधमध्वनि ।
धुतकङ्कणमस्तहंसकं द्रुतमम्भोनिधिमापुरापगाः ॥ ४१ ॥

मिहिरेन्दुशिला मिथः सदा विदधत्योऽपि विरुद्धकार्यताम् ।
निजनाथमहो निरोधके समये तामभुचन्समं शुचा ॥ ४२ ॥

स्ववितीर्णमिताम्बुवर्षिणो मुदिरादम्बुधिराप मुक्तिकाः ।
अपवर्जितमल्पमप्यहो प्रकटं सत्सुफलाय कल्पते ॥ ४३ ॥

अलयः कुटजासवं वनेष्वपिबन्नभ्रमदभ्रमम्बरे ।
अवनी समताडि धारया बत सद्यः पथिकैरखिद्यत ॥ ४४ ॥

रथमन्विसुहृच्छरासनैरहितः पञ्चभिरप्यहो शरैः ।
अखिलं जगदीशिता रतेरजयत्केवलमात्मगौरवात् ॥ ४५ ॥

सनवाम्बुजकैरवश्रियो घनवाचंयमतोपदेशकाः ।
अभवन्परिमृष्टपद्मिनीविभवस्वच्छदिशोऽथ वासराः ॥ ४६ ॥

अनवस्करभास्करप्रभैरनवस्कन्दनहंसविभ्रमैः ।
समशो भिदुराभयंकरैः समशोभि द्विरदेहितैर्दिनैः ॥ ४७ ॥

घनबन्धनमोचितौ दिवाकरचन्द्रौ शरदा कथंचन ।
विषमां नियतौ विना गतिं विदधाते स्म समं दिवानिशम् ॥ ४८ ॥

जलदागमजाड्यसंकुचत्स्थितयः क्वापि चिरं दिशोऽखिलाः ।
अभवन्ध्रुवमक्षिगोचरा द्युमणिद्योतसिसेविषावगात् ॥ ४९ ॥

सततोदकवर्षसंसजज्जलनीलीहरितो हरित्तटान् ।
करकौशलतः सुधाकरः कलयामास किलातिनिर्मलान् ॥ ५० ॥

वयमर्यमवैभवद्विषः कृतिनः प्रागधुना कृशाः स्वतः ।
इति तूर्णमिदं समीपतो धनदस्याम्बुधरा दिशं ययुः ॥ ५१ ॥

सलिलानि सरस्वतां घनैरभिवृष्यात्महृतानि वर्षितुम् ।
तुहिनानि तदाहृतेर्दिशा तुहिनग्रावशा व्यागाह्यत ॥ ५२ ॥

उचितेऽनुचितेऽपि संभृतान्युदकान्यम्बुमुचः स्थले मुहुः ।
अपवृज्य विपाण्डराः शुचेत्यहसन्काशरुचा दिशोऽखिलाः ॥ ५३ ॥

बुबुधे जगदालयो विभुर्भुजगेन्द्रे शयितो यतो रविः ।
परितोऽपि घनान्प्रलम्बिताः प्रतिसीराः समकोचयद्दिवि ॥ ५४ ॥

उदकानि निपीय वारिदैरुदधेः क्षारतराणि भूरिशः ।
कृशता शरदि क्रमाद्रुजा किमु पाण्डुत्वमपि स्म धार्यते ॥ ५५ ॥

शकलैर्घटितं पयोमुचां सकलं व्योमतलं व्यरोचत ।
शतकोटिविघर्षणैरिव श्लथसंधिर्जगदण्डकर्परः ॥ ५६ ॥

घनदुर्दिनजाड्यमोषधीकमितापास्य चिरं करैर्निजैः ।
स्पृशति स्म सतोषमोषधीः फलभारादिव भाविताननतीः ॥ ५७ ॥

जलमध्यजुषो रजस्वला जलजिन्यः सह हंससंसदा ।
रतिमादधतीति लज्जया व्यनमन्किं कलमाः पचेलिमाः ॥ ५८ ॥

अपुषन्परमम्भसा घनाः कलमानभ्रगताः शरत्पुनः ।
फलभागभवत्परैधितं फलति द्रागितरत्र भाग्यतः ॥ ५९ ॥

परिपोषिण एव कर्षकाः फलभारच्छलतः पुरो नतान् ।
कलमान्सखलाः कथं लुनन्त्यघुनेत्यध्वनि चुक्रुशुः शुकाः ॥ ६० ॥

मधुरं भुवि शालिपालिकामृदुगीतं मम वा फलं जनाः ।
त्रिमृशन्त्विति विभ्रगानमत्फलिना किं कदलीपरम्परा ॥ ६१ ॥

अभिरक्षितुमात्मनो जनान्कृषतश्छेदनकृत्यलोलुपान् ।
विदलत्परुषः स्म मुक्तिका विकिरन्ति ध्रुवमिक्षवोऽभितः ॥ ६२ ॥

घनबन्धनतः प्रमोचितः कमिता वः शरदेति शोभनाम् ।
न कथं गिरमूचुरादरान्नलिनीनां कलहंसिका रवैः ॥ ६३ ॥

सरसीषु सरोरुहाणि तत्प्रतिबिम्बाश्च बभुर्घनानलीन् ।
अधिगत्य बहिः स्थितानि तान्यवगाढान्यभयाद्भियादपि ॥ ६४ ॥

जलगर्भगते कुमुद्वतीजलजिन्यौ घनभीतितश्चिरम् ।
विधुतिग्मरुचौ विसारितैरुदहार्ष्टामुदकाद्बहिः करैः ॥ ६५ ॥

हरिणं गतमात्मवाहनं कणिशास्वादनकामनावशात् ।
अपहाय पदातिराशुगो विचचाराम्बुजवीथिकाः शनैः ॥ ६६ ॥

अहितं जलदागमं शरत्तरसापास्यत तद्भवामपि ।
भुवि कीर्त्तिमहो बुभूषिभिः सहनीया हि न शत्रुसंपदः ॥ ६७ ॥

श्रयतः स्म चकोरचातकौ भुवि दुर्भिक्षसुभिक्षमम्बुदैः ।
शरदा त्वथ तद्विपर्ययं समयो नैकगुणो हि जन्तुषु ॥ ६८ ॥

कलशीतनयान्न काप्यभूदुदिताद्भीरुदधेर्यदात्मनि ।
शरणागतसादरः स्वयम्बुबुधे जीवनपुण्यतो हरिः ॥ ६९ ॥

अजनिष्ट हठात्प्रबोधितो हरिरस्मल्लहरीझलज्झलैः ।
इति भीतिवशादिवापगा जलधिं प्रापुरजातनिस्वनाः ॥ ७० ॥

चलयाम दिगन्तकुञ्जरैः सममेतां विधृतां बलादिति ।
वसुधामिव वप्रखेलनच्छलतः स्म प्रहरन्ति दन्तिनः ॥ ७१ ॥

परहस्तिमदाम्बुसौरभभ्रममाधाय समेतरच्छदाः ।
निजगन्धभरैर्निरन्तरं करिणो रोषकषायितान्व्यधुः ॥ ७२ ॥

वर्षासु वारिधरवारितदिग्विभागास्वाक्रम्य सर्वमजयज्जगदुद्धतो यः ।
प्रासन्यशालिदिशि स प्रचुरप्रचारः कामो बभूव शरदीति कथं विचित्रम् ॥

स्वस्वारिक्षितिपालकप्रतिहतिस्वच्छन्दनैकावनी-
 प्राकारानिजयप्रयाणनिहतैः प्रौढा मुहुर्भीङ्कृतैः ।
निःसाणैः समगुद्गिरद्भिरभजन्निनिद्रभावं ध्रुवं
 पाथोराशिवरे चिरेण शयितः पद्मालयावल्लभः ॥ ७४ ॥

सोऽयं नेपालनेतुः पुनरधिनगरि स्थाननाथं तदीये
 सर्वान्दुर्गानगवानपि धरणिभृतः सत्वरं निर्जिगीषन् ।
जम्भारातिः सुधर्मामिव धिषणजयन्तान्वितो मन्त्रहेतो-
 र्भूपः प्रापचिताथो सचिवसुतयुतो जातु लक्ष्मीविलासम् ॥ ७५ ॥

युद्धसमुद्धतशत्रुजनत्रुटनप्रभवद्धरितहयरितमितस्थितसुस्थिरसद्विभव ।
भव्यकृतिव्यसनक्षमरक्षणकर्मपटो चित्तवसत्तरवल्लवतल्लजनर्मवटो ॥ ७६ ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपु-
प्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।
कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो
जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥ ७७ ॥

श्रीगोविन्दमखीन्दुवंशमणिना श्रीयज्ञनारायणा-
भिख्येनाध्वरिणा कृते मधुसुधारोधाय मेधाविना ।
सर्गोऽयं नवमोऽप्यभूदनवमः संभावनीयैर्गुणै-
रत्नाकद्वदविद्वदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ ७८ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-
चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्याप्तवाजपेययाजि-
गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-
याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ
साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये
नवमः सर्गः ।

दशमः सर्गः ।

ससुतो वसुधासुधाकरोऽसौ सह गोविन्दमखीन्दुना सभायाम् ।
समगादथ तत्र गोत्रभेदो सजयन्तो गुरुणा यथामराणाम् ॥ १ ॥

प्रभुरेष ततोऽनु भद्रपीठे सचिवेनात्मभुवं समं निवेश्य ।
अपराङ्गमुपाश्रितोपबर्हं विमताज्ञातमुपाविशद्वितन्वन् ॥ २ ॥

प्रभुतत्सुतमन्त्रिणः सभायां परमेते समसस्मरन्वसन्तः ।
प्रथमं मिलितं प्रपञ्चसृष्टेः पुरुषाणां त्रितयं पुरातनानाम् ॥ ३ ॥

सचिवो नृपतेर्नृपो विवक्षां सचिवस्यापि तयोश्च राजसूनुः ।
प्रतिपाल्य परस्परं सभायामदुषन्मौनममी मुहूर्तमात्रम् ॥ ४ ॥

त्रिभिरेकफलाय तैर्विवक्षात्रितयेनोन्मिषितान्तरैरपीषि ।
अपरत्र बुधैरमानितोऽपि प्रगुणत्वेन परस्पराश्रयोऽस्मिन् ॥ ५ ॥

वचनान्यभवन्व्यवस्थितानि त्रिषु तेष्वेकफलानि संमिलन्ति ।
त्रिविधेष्विव शाखिषु द्विजेषु प्रभवेनाविदितानि भाषितानि ॥ ६ ॥

बदरीकुणशोणमक्षिकोणं वसुधायामथ वासवोऽवतीर्णः ।
कृपणासुलभं कृपाणिकायामतनोदाशयमप्यतः प्रकाशम् ॥ ७ ॥

सचिवो नृपतेः स्वतो विवक्षां हृदि जानन्नपि तत्कृतेङ्गितेन ।
स विदन्निव तां ततः प्रगल्भामुचितज्ञो गिरमुज्जगार धीरः ॥ ८ ॥

अवनीन्द्रसमीहिताविरुद्धा सचिवोक्तिर्विधिषु स्वतन्त्रवृत्तिः ।
प्रभवेज्जनताप्रमोदसिद्ध्यै श्रुतितात्पर्यहिता स्मृतिर्यथैव ॥ ९ ॥

प्रबलोऽपि निसर्गतो निदेशः प्रभुचन्द्रस्य परिष्कृतो वचोभिः ।
सचिवस्य हि कल्पते क्रियासु स्मृतिवाक्यैरिव वैदिको नियोगः ॥ १० ॥

अधिचेतसमाहितं त्वदीये करवालानिशकाङ्क्षितं विधेयम् ।
तरसा करणेऽपि तस्य हेतुं धरणीपाल यथातथं वदामि ॥ ११ ॥

युधि वीतकृपा कृपाणिकासावधिप द्वेषिकरोटिभिः कदुष्णम् ।
चषकै रुधिरं नवं पिपासुर्विषयानद्विषतः पुरा करोति ॥ १२ ॥

तरवारिलता नृप त्वदीया धिषणेव द्विषतः परैरभेद्यम् ।
हृदयं हितमन्त्रवर्मगुप्तं भृशमेषा त्वरितं भिनत्तु भूयः ॥ १३ ॥
अचिरादनरेन्द्रमन्त्रसाध्यः प्रबलोऽयं नृप पारसीकदेहान् ।
प्रविशन्नसिपन्नगस्त्वदीयः पिबतु प्राणसमीरणान्रणाग्रे ॥ १४ ॥
अधिनेतरयन्ति पारसीका युधि नेपालनृपं पराभवन्तः ।
अधुना खलु चोलकं सहायं विधुनानं तव शासनं बलेन ॥ १५ ॥
नृपचन्द्र नृशंसवृत्तिरास्ते स तथा संप्रति चोलको धरायाम् ।
प्रवदन्ति जना यथा मुनीनां प्रवरं हन्त दशाननं चरित्रैः ॥ १६ ॥
अभवद्बहुकालकूटबाधानुभवस्तोयनिधेश्चिरंतनो यः ।
अधुना स निजान्तरैकवासं सहतश्चोलकमस्य साधनैव ॥ १७ ॥
पथिकान्मिलतः पथिष्वजस्रं बत गोणीकृतभस्त्रिकासु बद्ध्वा ।
मुसलैः स विभो मुहुः प्रहार्य क्षिपति ग्राहमुखेषु निर्निमित्तम् ॥ १८ ॥
वनदंष्ट्रिभिराहता त्वदीयैः कलमालील्यभिधायिनां जनानाम् ।
अधिरोपयतेऽधिरोमकूपं शितसूचीरहह क्षमासितांशो ॥ १९ ॥
पथि तोयपिपासया प्रपासु प्रसितान्दुग्धदिदिक्षयेव पान्थान् ।
स बलादुपहूय तप्तसीसद्रवमेवाहह पाययत्यजस्रम् ॥ २० ॥
इयता वचसा यदेकदेशोऽप्यधुना नाभिहितस्तदस्य सर्वम् ।
चरितं हतकस्य शक्यते तन्न मया वर्णयितुं नमः शिवाय ॥ २१ ॥
भवता नरपालकेन्द्र भग्ने निहते चोलकनाम्नि नीतिमार्गात् ।
प्रभवो न भवन्ति पारसीकाः पुरि नेपालविभुं पुनर्निरोद्धुम् ॥ २२ ॥
सचिवोक्तमिति श्रवःपुटाभ्यां परिगृह्णन्रघुनाथपार्थिवेन्द्रः ।
अगदीदिति दन्तदीधितिभ्यो जनयन्नर्म दिवापि चन्द्रिकाणाम् ॥ २३ ॥
निहते युधि चोलके नृशंसे निहता एव भवन्ति पारसीकाः ।
नरनाथ निजाश्रयस्य बाधे नयसिद्धो न किमाश्रितस्य बाधः ॥ २४ ॥
अवनीन्द्र तवाश्रितस्य पादौ पुरि नेपालविभोः पुनः प्रतिष्ठाम् ।
अयमाशु विधातुमभ्युपायः परमस्मिन्प्रतिभाति किंचिदेवम् ॥ २५ ॥

अविवेकनिधिः स पाण्ड्यभूपो भुवि वेतण्ड इव भ्रमन्मदेन ।
नरपालमृगाधिपे स्वशक्त्या निरपाये त्वयि शात्रवं विधत्ते ॥ २६ ॥

प्रबलं बत शात्रवं स पाण्ड्यः प्रभुचन्द्र त्वयि शीलयत्यहेतु ।
अधुना तु सचोलकस्य तस्मिन्नपि तुण्डीरविभोः प्रवर्तनेन ॥ २७ ॥

बहुभिर्मृधमेकदा परैर्यत्प्रबलोऽपि क्षितिपालको न कुर्यात् ।
तदमी विषयेषु विप्रकीर्णा धरणीन्दो युगपत्त्वया न योध्याः ॥ २८ ॥

अवतंस्य वचस्तदस्य मन्त्री नयसिन्धो रघुनाथमेदिनीन्दोः ।
अवदत्स वदावदप्रवेकः परमानन्दथुबन्धुरान्तरङ्गः ॥ २९ ॥

धिषणा रघुनाथनेतुरेषा धिषणाक्षेपणनैपुणीनिरूढा ।
अतिसूर्यकरग्रहान्पदार्थानतिसूक्ष्मापि विभाति भासयन्ती ॥ ३० ॥

अयतेऽस्य वचोऽनवद्यमर्थं श्रयतेऽर्थो नृपचन्द्र नीतितत्त्वम् ।
तनुतेऽपि च नीतितत्त्वमेतत्प्रकृतेऽतिप्रवणां मतिं विधेये ॥ ॥ ३१ ॥

प्रभुरेष तदेति भाषितेन प्रसवेनेव सदालिमोददात्रा ।
सरसेन फलैकसाधनेन व्यतनोन्मन्त्रिणमुल्लसद्वतंसम् ॥ ३२ ॥

अनयैव किल त्वयानुपूर्व्या वदता कश्चन वैरिणां नृपाणाम् ।
प्रणिधिश्चरितस्य पाण्ड्यभूपप्रभृतीनां प्रहितो विचारणाय ॥ ३३ ॥

नयनं प्रणिधिर्नरेश्वराणां नयमार्गे चरतां सदातिशेते ।
असमीपगतार्थबोधकत्वात्परभूपालरहःप्रकाशनाच्च ॥ ३४ ॥

अवनीविभुरान्तरेण चारैरपि पश्यन्नयनेन सावधानम् ।
द्विषतः सहजान्हि धर्मबुद्धेर्विषयस्यापि सदा जयत्ययत्नम् ॥ ३५ ॥

द्वितयाधिकमेकमक्षि शंभोर्नृपतेस्तद्द्वयमान्तरं स्पशश्च ।
मथिता प्रथमो हि काममन्यो महिपान्काममुखान्षडप्यरातीन् ॥ ३६ ॥

प्रणिधिर्दृगिवोचितानुरागः प्रभुचन्द्रस्य हितप्रवृत्तिहेतुः ।
श्रवणानतिलङ्घनस्वभावः प्रथतेऽलोकपरिष्क्रियानभिज्ञः ॥ ३७ ॥

प्रणिधिः किमिति प्रतीपभूमीपतिसंदोहचिकीर्षितं विवेक्तुम् ।
प्रहितः स चिरायतीति सोऽयं पतिदध्यौ मनसा ततो जगाद ॥ ३८ ॥

बहुरूपपटुः प्रवेश्यमानः प्रथकोऽथ प्रतिहारपालकेन ।
समलक्ष्यत मङ्क्षु स स्पशोऽयं सविधे तस्य शतक्रतोरवन्याः ॥ ३९ ॥
प्रणिपत्य स पत्युरुर्वरायाः प्रणिधिस्तस्य पदं भयानताङ्गः ।
वसनाञ्चलगर्भितेन पाणिद्वितयेनाभिदधे मुखं पिधाय ॥ ४० ॥
फलपर्यवसायि भाषितं मे श्रुतिकाले न विभो सुखाकरोति ।
इति संप्रति मौनमाश्रितं मामिह संभाषयते चराधिकारः ॥ ४१ ॥
वचनानि यथायथं श्रुतानि व्यवहर्तुं श्रवणे कटूभवन्ति ।
प्रयते न बिभेमि चाभिजानन्प्रभुचन्द्रस्य तवाधिकं विवेकम् ॥ ४२ ॥
अनतिश्रुतमायतिक्षमं च ब्रुवति प्रेम तवास्तु भूप मा वा ।
अनवेक्ष्य हिताहिते निजे हि स्वविभोः पश्यति सौख्यमेव भृत्यः ॥ ४३ ॥
इति वाक्यमुदीरितं चरेण प्रबलन्यायपरिष्कृतं निशम्य ।
जगदेकहितैषिणाथ सोऽयं जगदे तेन मुदा जनाधिपेन ॥ ४४ ॥
प्रभुकार्यपराङ्मुखः स्वकार्यं कलयन्स्वप्रभुकार्ययोः समानः ।
प्रभुकार्यपरो धुतस्वकार्योऽप्यवनीन्दोरिति मन्त्रिणस्त्रिधा स्युः ॥ ४५ ॥
विविधान्सचिवानिति स्वरूपैर्विनयैरप्यविवेचनीयभेदान् ।
विभजत्यवनीविभौ यथावद्वसुधा तद्भुजवश्यतां प्रयाति ॥ ४६ ॥
प्रतिभा श्रुतमौचितो धृतिश्च प्रभुचन्द्रस्य तदा फलन्ति कामम् ।
सचिवा यदि सन्ति पञ्च षड्वा स्वविधेयेषु समुद्य जागरूकाः ॥ ४७ ॥
अखिला नरपालमात्मकार्यप्रवणा हन्त तदा प्रतारयन्ति ।
यदि न स्वसमो यथार्थवेदी निजकार्ये धुरि नीतिमानमात्यः ॥ ४८ ॥
अभिधत्स्व चरोऽप्यमात्यकल्पः प्रभुकार्यैकपरायणो यतस्त्वम् ।
प्रतिघो न भवेदनेन किं तु प्रमदो मे स्पश तेन मा स्म भैषीः ॥ ४९ ॥
प्रणिधिस्तदनुज्ञया प्रणीतप्रणिधानः प्रणिपत्य यावदर्थम् ।
अयतिष्ट यदिष्टमष्टदिक्षु प्रभवेत्तत्प्रभवे निवेदयिष्यन् ॥ ५० ॥
भुजधाम तदेव भूवलारेर्गणनीयं यदहो गणे रिपूणाम् ।
स्वपुरेषु रहो विनूयमानं प्रणिधिर्गूढपदं मुहुः शृणोति ॥ ५१ ॥

महिपस्य यशस्तदुच्यते यन्महिसिन्धौ वलयाचलेन्द्रसेतौ ।
परिपूरितमन्ततः समन्तात्प्रथते दुग्धमिव स्वकीयभूम्ना ॥ ५२ ॥

भुजधाम यशोऽपि तादृशं ते भुवि नान्यस्य तदेतदच्युतेन्द्रो ।
अहमेव विदिक्षु दिक्षु सीमास्वपि सर्वासु चरंश्चिराय जाने ॥ ५३ ॥

विजिता बहुधा पृथक्पृथक्ते विमताः पाण्ड्यमुखास्त्वया रणेषु ।
मिलिताः शपथैर्मिथः समस्ताः पुनरप्यत्र पुराभिषेणयन्ते ॥ ५४ ॥

अनुजोऽथ चिरादनन्यमित्रं पुरि कर्णाटकभूपतिं सबन्धुम् ।
निजनाथमहो निहत्य कैश्चित्समगात्पाण्ड्यनृपेण जग्गराजः ॥ ५५ ॥

पुरि तत्र हते स्वपुत्रपौत्रैः सह कर्णाटनृपे तदावशिष्टम् ।
परिगृह्य तदात्मजं स याचप्रभुरन्यैश्च समायियासतीह ॥ ५६ ॥

अधिरङ्गममी मिलन्ति यावद्युधि मत्ता रिपवः सपाण्ड्यभूपाः ।
पुर एव ततोऽमुना विधेयं तव कर्णाटनृपात्मजेन सख्यम् ॥ ५७ ॥

स मनोजवसौ न किं विधेयात्सुमनोराजनिभः सुतो विधेयम् ।
अहिताः सकला युयुत्सया ते प्रहितास्तत्र मिलन्तु भूप मा वा ॥ ५८ ॥

लघुना वचसा युतः कथं वा रघुनाथक्षितिपस्य तं प्रतापम् ।
कथयाम्यहितैर्यदीययाहं कथया विस्मितवान्प्रयुक्तयेव ॥ ५९ ॥

नृपधूर्वहतां निजे तनूजे वसुधायास्तटिनीवरावृतायाः ।
वितनुष्व रणेष्वसौ विशङ्को विमतानाशु विनाशयत्ययत्नम् ॥ ६० ॥

अनपायविभुत्वहेतुमेतत्स निपाय स्पशवाक्यमच्युतेन्द्रः ।
प्रति तं वचनं प्रमोदमानः प्रथितं किंचन वर्णयांचकार ॥ ६१ ॥

विजिता बहवो दिशामधीशा बहुधाभोजि वसुंधराप्यशेषा ।
विदुषामपि संभृतं व्यतारि द्रविणं किं परमस्ति मे विधेयम् ॥ ६२ ॥

परमेतदिहावशिष्यते मे परमेऽस्मिन्रघुनाथनाम्नि पुत्रे ।
अवनीभरमाकलय्य शत्रूनवनीतानमुना विजापयिष्ये ॥ ६३ ॥

तदमुं धरणीतलेन्द्रतायामभिषिञ्चे त्वमपि द्रुतं विकीर्णैः ।
सविधं मम कैश्चन क्षितीन्द्रैः सह कर्णाटनृपात्मजं नयस्व ॥ ६४ ॥

उदितामिति सोऽयमुर्वरेन्दोर्वदनात्कल्पकमञ्जरीं वतंस्य ।
निरतो महति स्पशो विधेये निरगाद्भूभृदगारतोऽतिवेगात् ॥ ६५ ॥
निजपार्श्वभुवं प्रसाधयन्तं नृपचन्द्रो रघुनाथपार्थिवं तम् ।
अवलोक्य स मन्त्रिणाथ वाणीमवतंस्यामिति वर्णयांबभूव ॥ ६६ ॥
सरिदीशवृता वसुंधरेयं चतुरङ्गेण पुरी युता बलेन ।
अखिला प्रकृतिर्भवत्प्रधानाप्यनुनेदं प्रथमं भवेत्सनाथा ॥ ६७ ॥
तनयो विनयोज्ज्वलो विवेकी धरणीन्दोर्यदि भूरनेन धन्या ।
अपरस्य स तादृशोऽस्तु मा वा यदमुष्यापि भृतिः परैर्विधेया ॥ ६८ ॥
प्रभुरात्मभवस्य नीतिपद्याप्रवणस्य प्रकृतिप्रमोदहेतोः ।
न किमा नरपालकत्वशक्तेर्नगरीकोशबलादिरक्षितेव ॥ ६९ ॥
पटुधाम्नि सदाश्रवे कुमारे प्रतिपक्षा नृपतेर्यथा त्रसन्ति ।
अखिला स्वमतादृशे तु तस्मिन्नवजानन्ति तथा बत स्वपक्षाः ॥ ७० ॥
विनयादिगुणोज्ज्वलत्वमुर्वीविभुसूनुत्वमपि द्वयं न यस्य ।
परिपालयिता स चेत्प्रजानां क्व धनं क्वात्मभवाः क्व वा स्वदाराः ॥ ७१ ॥
अवनीं पितुरागतामरक्षन्परमस्याः प्रभुरन्यपालितां च ।
अवनीन्दुरिमामपि प्रशासन्त्रिविधास्तेऽधममध्यमोत्तमाः स्युः ॥ ७२ ॥
अवनीविभुमन्त्रिणौ स्वतन्त्रावपि संभूय विधेयमेकमेव ।
कुरुतो नयने यथैकमर्थं कुशले द्वे युगपन्निशामयेते ॥ ७३ ॥
महिपस्य महाहवेषु यष्टुः सचिवोऽध्वर्युरितः सहार्त्विजीनैः ।
अधिकारिभिराहुतस्य मन्युज्वलने भाति सुताज्ञयाय राज्ञः ॥ ७४ ॥
सचिवो धिषणेव सांख्यशास्त्रप्रथिता कर्मसु कर्तृभावमेति ।
फलभागिदमात्मवत्पृथिव्याः परिणेता क्वचिदप्यसक्त एव ॥ ७५ ॥
कुशलो रघुनाथभूमिपालः कुलकूटस्थपुरोहित त्वयायम् ।
अधुनाहमिवात्तराजनीतिः प्रभवेद्भूपरिपालने मखीन्द्रो ॥ ७६ ॥
निखिलाप्यमुना नृपालनीतिः स्वत एवाधिकृता विभो तथापि ।
अहमत्र नियोगमद्य कुर्वे भवतोऽशून्यमिति स्म भाषते सः ॥ ७७ ॥

नृपतेस्तनुजेन नीतिशास्त्राध्ययनोत्साहवतायमर्थ्यमानः ।
अथ तामनुमध्यजोगपद्यामधिगत्यैव कलामयन्ति राज्यम् ॥ ७८ ॥

प्रभुतानवयौवनाभिरूप्यप्रबलत्वप्रमुखैर्युतो गुणौघैः ।
द्विषतो यदि शास्ति काममुख्यान्विभुरेतेन तदा मही सनाथा ॥ ७९ ॥

अवितं पुरमिन्द्रियप्रचारैररिभिः काममुखैः सदावरुद्धम् ।
पुरमप्यपरं भुवोऽधिनेतुः स्वत एवावति शात्रवावरोधात् ॥ ८० ॥

सहजारिसुतावरोधभृत्यस्वसमीपप्रभुशत्रुभूपतिभ्यः ।
अवितोऽपि बलेन शङ्कमानो भुवि याति क्षितिपः स्थिरां प्रतिष्ठाम् ॥ ८१ ॥

प्रभुरेव यतः स्वयं प्रजानामिह चामुत्र च साधको हितेषु ।
परिपालनमात्मनोऽपि भुक्तिप्रमुखैस्तद्व्यसनैः प्रजार्थमेव ॥ ८२ ॥

प्रभुरात्मनि वेदताप्रतीतिः प्रकृतीनां सततं यथा स्वतः स्यात् ।
प्रतिपालयतामभूत्तथैव प्रभुरित्येव हि न प्रजा रमन्ते ॥ ८३ ॥

अखिलैरपि भूभृदात्मभिन्नैरनिशं स्वस्वसमीहितैकतानैः ।
प्रतिकार्यमयं प्रतार्यमाणो भजति स्वाभिमतं फलं कथं वा ॥ ८४ ॥

स्वकुलक्रमवेदिभिर्विशुद्धैः प्रभुकार्यैकपरैः सदाप्यमात्यैः ।
यदि मन्त्रयते यथावदुर्वीपतिरस्याशु तदा फलं करस्थम् ॥ ८५ ॥

अविमर्दसहादवेत्य यत्नाद्विषयादस्फुटवृत्तयोऽपि चोराः ।
वसुधापतिना व्यपोहनीयाः स्थितमक्ष्णो जठरात्तृणं यथैव ॥ ८६ ॥

मन्त्रो महेन्द्रस्य मनीषितार्थप्राप्तेः पुरस्तात्परगोचरश्चेत् ।
अमित्रमित्रं तनुभूरिवात्मनाशैकहेतुर्न किमञ्जसा स्यात् ॥ ८७ ॥

अवैद्यकापेक्षि रसायनं मतेरदेहसादि स्थविरत्वमात्मनः ।
अनस्तिभारा श्रवसोरलंक्रिया गुरूपदेशो न गुणाय किं नृणाम् ॥ ८८ ॥

रमा तावद्वसेद्गेहे राज्ञो यावन्न जायते ।
इयती संपदेवालमित्यश्लोलतरा मतिः ॥ ८९ ॥

वसु कोशभृतं वसुंधरापतिरुग्रैः परिपालयेद्भटैः ।
सरितां परिणीर्यथा मणीन्सलिलस्थान्प्रकरेण यादसाम् ॥ ९० ॥

वसु दत्तमल्पमपि वाञ्छितं सतां सहसाभिवर्धयति संपदं विभोः ।
प्रतिपादितं परिमितं पयोमुचां सलिलं यथा मणिगणान्सरित्पतेः ॥ ९१ ॥

मधूनि पुष्पाणि मधुव्रतो यथा वसूनि गृह्णन्वसुधाधिपो जनान् ।
हठात्परैर्दुर्ग्रहमा प्रदानतः फणामणीं पालयतां फणी यथा ॥ ९२ ॥

दुर्गे गुप्ते दुर्जयोऽपि स्वशक्त्या कुर्याद्वासं कोविदो भूमिपालः ।
श्वेतद्वीपे सिन्धुखेये न किं वा लक्ष्मीजानी राजधानीमतानीत् ॥ ९३ ॥

प्रभोर्न किं बलवति दुर्बलेऽपि वा प्रवर्तते द्विषति समं पराक्रमः ।
मृगाधिपो मदकरिणो मृगस्य वा विनिग्रहे भवति हि तुल्यविक्रमः ॥

अखिलानपि सद्गुणान्विभोरभिबोभोति हि नास्तिकं मनः ।
असितं व्रणमान्तरं यथा महतीं हीरमणेरनर्घताम् ॥ ९५ ॥

उपेक्षयतां प्रभुरविक्रमोत्सुकः कदर्यमप्यसुहृदमाः कथं नयेत् ।
तमाः पराभवतितमां रिपुः स कोऽप्यहर्पतेरपि नृपते महो न किम् ॥ ९६ ॥

ससाध्यसाक्रमविधिसाग्रहा रिपुग्रहाः कथं क्षितिपतिभिः सुनिग्रहाः ।
अभूतिकैरनिशममन्त्रचिन्तनातुरायणैरवनितुषारदीधिते ॥ ९७ ॥

समीपतो रिपुरपरः सखा ततः सखा रिपोस्तदनु सुहृद्रिपुः पुरः ।
द्विषत्सखस्य च नृपतिः सखेत्यमी विभोर्जयोन्मुखमनसः पुरःसराः ॥ ९८ ॥

पार्ष्णिग्राहाक्रन्दयोः शत्रुमित्रं पश्चादाद्यो मित्रमन्यो जिगीषोः ।
आसारौ द्वावेनयोश्चारिमित्रे विख्याताः स्युर्नीतिविद्भिर्महीन्द्राः ॥ ९९ ॥

विजिगीषोररेश्चान्यो विदिग्देशे स मध्यमः ।
असंयुजोः संयुजोश्च निग्रहेऽनुग्रहे प्रभुः ॥ १०० ॥

विजिगीषुशत्रुमध्यमविषयेभ्योऽन्यत्र यः स्थितस्तेषाम् ।
शक्तः स युजामयुजां संरक्षणशिक्षयोरुदासीनः ॥ १०१ ॥

इत्यात्मजं निजमसावित्यमच्युतेन्दुरत्यादरेण धृतनीतिमथादधानम् ।
आविःप्रमोदमुचितामवलोक्य वाणीं गोविन्दयज्वतिलकं गुणवानवादीत् ॥

सौम्ये भाविनि वासरे शुभतरे शौण्डीर्यमुख्यैर्गुणैः
प्रख्यातं रघुनाथनामकममुं प्रौढापदानं सुतम् ।
क्षिप्रं त्वं चतुरर्णवीपरिवृतक्षोणीतलप्राभवे
कुर्याः कौतुकतोऽभिषिक्तमखिलैर्गोविन्दयज्वाग्रणीः ॥ १०३ ॥

कुर्वंस्तद्वचनं व्रतंसमुचितं गोविन्दयज्वा ततः
पौराणामभिषेकमङ्गलकृते प्रावीवृतत्संभ्रमम् ।
साऽपि श्रीरघुनाथभूमिरमणः स्वावासगेहं मुदा
प्राग्भारेण समं समाविशदिति प्रह्वैः परीतो नृपैः ॥ १०४ ॥

अक्षुद्रमधुरताद्रवदिक्षुद्रवजनककवन सन्नवन ।
उद्धतवृत्तिरिपुस्थितियुद्धतलभ्राजमानभुजतेजः ॥ १०५ ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपु-
प्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।
कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो
जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥ १०६ ॥

श्रीगोविन्दमखीन्दुवंशमणिना श्रीयज्ञनारायणा-
भिख्येनाध्वरिणा कृते मधुसुधारोधाय मेधाविना ।
सर्गोऽयं दशमो द्विषन्मदशमोऽप्यासीत्समग्रैर्गुणै-
रत्नाकृद्वदविद्वदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ १०७ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-
चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्याप्तवाजपेययाजि-
गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-
याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ
साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये
दशमः सर्गः ।

एकादशः सर्गः ।

अथ मागधाः कतिचिदस्य भुपतेः स्वपनोपयोगपरिशोभितं गृहम् ।
अभजन्त मन्दमपनिद्रकञ्चुकिप्रतिहारदेशमुषसि प्रसाधितम् ॥ १ ॥

अनिले भयादिव कुतोऽप्यनागते निभृतप्रदीपनिकुरम्बमेककम् ।
पुरतः स्थितं सहपुरोहितद्वयैर्मगधैरलङ्घि मणिधाम भूपतेः ॥ २ ॥

अबलाजनैरवितमान्तरालयप्रतिहारमत्र दृढबन्धनाररम् ।
प्रतिपद्य वर्षवरपङ्क्तिभिः क्षणं प्रघणे समौनमवसन्भयादमी ॥ ३ ॥

उषसि प्रसन्नमतिरुर्वरापतिः शयितः स्वयं स शयनेऽतिशोभने ।
शरदीव वारिधिशयस्तदा जगत्परिपालनैकरसिकः प्रबुद्धवान् ॥ ४ ॥

चरणोपसंग्रहणचातुरीजुषां सुदृशां स्थिते सपदि कङ्कणारवे ।
परिचारिकासु कतिचित्प्रबुध्य तं शयितास्त्रसेविषत सादरा दरात् ॥ ५ ॥

अखिलास्ततोऽनु हरिणेक्षणाः क्षणादपरा धुतस्वपनमस्य भूपतेः ।
व्यजनप्रकीर्णवहनादिकं क्रमादुपचारमात्मचरितोचितं व्यधुः ॥ ६ ॥

नवहेमतन्तुचयनादृशोभिनीः परितोऽपरा यवनिकाः प्रलम्बिनीः ।
समकोचयन्मणिगृहप्रभाभरस्थगनासहेव सरसीरुहेक्षणा ॥ ७ ॥

घनसारतैलकलिताभिवर्धनाः कतमा दधुर्धुरि तथा प्रदीपिकाः ।
हरितां समस्तमवकाशमाशुगो नयते यथा नवनवं स्म सौरभम् ॥ ८ ॥

गमकादिभेदकमनीयमुल्लसद्गति तानसंततिकरम्बितार्जवम् ।
समयोक्तरागविधया शनैः परा जगुरस्य मानवजगत्पतेर्गुणान् ॥ ९ ॥

स्वमुखांशुसाधिमसमानवैभवं मणिदर्पणं मृगदृशान्यया पुरः ।
विधृतं रुषेव विभुरैक्षत क्षितेस्तलिमं विसृज्य तनुपूर्वभागतः ॥ १० ॥

मगधा विबुध्य महिपप्रबोधनं समयज्ञयौवतसमग्रगानतः ।
द्रुतमस्य ते स्तुतिकरम्बितैर्गिरां ग्रथनैर्जगुर्गमकभेदमानितम् ॥ ११ ॥

अयि सुप्रभातमिदमस्तु ते तथा रतिनाथरूप रघुनाथभूपते ।
प्रकृतं यथा प्रकृतिकाङ्क्षितं भवेदखिलावनीभृत्कृतेऽभिषेचनम् ॥ १२ ॥

अभिषेकमङ्गलकृतेऽधिमण्डपं प्रभया निबद्धपटमौक्तिकस्पृशा ।
विधुता ह्रियेव विजहाति भूप सा तरसा महांसि दिवि तारकावलिः ॥
स्वपयःसमाहृतिविदग्धसरिद्वरप्रहितो मुदेव पतिरेष रोचिषाम् ।
अभिषेकमङ्गलमवेक्षितुं रयादुदयाद्रिशृङ्गमुदितोऽधिरोहति ॥ १४ ॥
विजहन्महस्कमतिविघ्नलाञ्छनं कुहचित्स्वयजत्कुवलयप्रमोदनम् ।
द्रवति क्षितौ दिवि च राजमण्डलं त्वयि भास्करेऽप्युदयभाजि संप्रति ॥
स्वमिवानुरूपपतिका वसुंधरा भवतीयमद्य भवतोऽभिषेचने ।
सुचिरादितीव शुभलाभतो विभो शनकैर्दिशा हसति शातमन्यवी ॥ १६ ॥
मलिनाशयाः प्रतिदिशं मलिम्लुचैरभिसारिका गतिमपावृतां निजाम् ।
तरसा त्यजन्त्यतिभियेत्यदूषितस्तमसा भवत्यवनिनाथ सत्पथः ॥ १७ ॥
भवतो रवेरपि च पादमाहितं धरणीभृतस्त्वरितमेव मौलिभिः ।
भुवि ये वहन्ति भृशमुग्रशार्वरप्रभवाः पदेषु सुलभं प्रशाम्यति [?]॥ १८ ॥
अधुना विभो परिचिताखिलागमा विचरन्ति भोः सरभसं द्विजातयः ।
भवतो वसुग्रहणतत्पराशया हरिदन्तराक्रमणलोलुपाश्च ते ॥ १९ ॥
कमलाभिवर्धनकराः करा रवौ त्वयि चाधुनाभ्युदयवर्तिनि क्षणात् ।
सकलङ्कराजकरसादितं मुहुः सुखयन्ति चक्रमखिलं स्वभावतः ॥ २० ॥
इति ते विनुत्य धरणीश्वरं चिरं वचनैरमुं तदनु वन्दिनो बहिः ।
अगमन्कवाटयुगमप्यथादधुः कनकोज्ज्वलं विघटितं मृगीदृशः ॥ २१ ॥
पुरतो विधाय स पुरोहितौ हितौ दधिदूर्वमाशु धरणीभृदागतौ ।
शुभवादिनौ सुललितैर्विलोकितैः कृपयापि तावनुगृहीतवानयम् ॥ २२ ॥
अबलाकराब्जमवलम्ब्य मेदिनीवलभित्प्रलम्बिवसनाञ्चलाञ्चितः ।
उपभुक्तचन्दनभृतोत्तरच्छदादुदतिष्ठदेष तलिमादुदारधीः ॥ २३ ॥
कपिलां समीपमथ काचिदञ्जसानयति स्म गां नरपतेस्तलोदरी ।
पुरतो वलन्निजपुरोहितद्वयः प्रकटं व्यधादयमपि प्रदक्षिणम् ॥ २४ ॥
अवतार्य भूषणगणानहर्मुखस्नपनोचिताकृति मुदा शनैरयम् ।
स महीपतिः शयमसद्मनि स्थितां मणिवेदिमत्र महितामुपाविशत् ॥ २५ ॥

व्यजनेन काचिदबला वलत्कुचद्वयलोलहारवलयोत्तरीयकम् ।
घनरावदूर्ककरकङ्कणं शनैरमुमोशितारमवनेरवीजयत् ॥ २६ ॥

सुमजालकेन सुरभीकृतं पुरा सृजती कचैरपि समग्रसौरभम् ।
उपगृह्य तैलमुचितं स्म तं परा सुदृगभ्यनक्ति वसुधासुधाकरम् ॥ २७ ॥

मणिपीठवर्तिनि महीपतौ पुरो निदधुर्घटांस्तुहिननीरपूरितान् ।
कनकाहितान्कतिचन स्तनद्युतिप्रतिरोधिताप्रतिघगौरवादिव ॥ २८ ॥

अपरा परागमवनीशकैशिके नवचन्दनद्रवकृतं नतोदरी ।
सरलीकृते नखमुखैः सकौशलं व्यतनीत्कपोलवलमानकुण्डलम् ॥ २९ ॥

मृगनाभिगन्धरसमिश्रितैर्हिमैर्नरचन्द्रमा मृगदृशा नखंपचैः ।
कलशेन रत्नखचितेन सोऽन्यया स्नपितोऽजनि स्वविभुतोचितं शनैः ॥

स्नपितो विमृष्टसलिलद्रवोंऽशुकै रमणीय एष रमणो भुवः स्वतः ।
अखिलैर्विनापि नवरत्नभूषणैररुचत्ततोऽधिकमहो महोभरैः ॥ ३१ ॥

शशिनं नभोगमतिशैत्यदुःसहं सहसा विहाय भुवि चन्द्रिकामसौ । ॥
स्वमिवागतां नृपतिचन्द्रमा नवामवसिष्ट धौतरुचिमंशुकद्वयीम् ॥ ३२ ॥

लघुधूपतो ललनयाधिवासिताः स्वत एव सौरभवहा विभोः कचाः ।
प्रभुवैभवप्रकटनाय केवलं परथा यतो भवति सिद्धसाधनम् ॥ ३३ ॥

उपविश्य पीठमुचितं वसुंधरारमणः स नैकविधरत्नवर्मितम् ।
कुटिलभ्रुवा मृगमदेन मेदुरान्कुरलानबन्धयत कोमलानयम् ॥ ३४ ॥

अधिरोपितेऽधिकुचमन्यया शयद्वितयेन रत्नमुकुरे विभुस्तदा ।
प्रतिबिम्बितो धुरि पराभिरीक्षितो हृदयं तदीयमिव संगतः स्वयम् ॥ ३५ ॥

मृगनाभिचित्रकमधान्महीपतिः कुरलैर्मधुव्रतकुलेन चोदितम् ।
स्वजनेषु कंचिदिव सख्यसिद्धये धुरि नासिकाकनकसूनसंनिधौ ॥ ३६ ॥

भसितं सितं धरणिपालमण्डलीविभुनामुनाध्यधि विशेषकं धृतम् ।
स्वत एव रम्यमपि वक्त्रमंशुमत्सृजतः स्म कीर्तिरिव तस्य राजते ॥ ३७ ॥

कमिता भुवः सुमनसां कदम्बकैश्चिरमादरेण शिरसोपलालितः ।
स्वयमप्यलालयत तान्ययं तथा कृतिषु स्फुटं हि घटते कृतज्ञता ॥ ३८ ॥

मकुटादिभिर्मणिविभूषणैरसाववनीवलारिरखिलैरलंकृतः ।
भगवन्तमम्बुरुहिणीपतिं शनैरुपहृत्य भक्तिमधिकामुपास्थित ॥ ३९ ॥
प्रतिभूषणं मणिषु पद्मिनीविभुं प्रतिबिम्बितं नरपतिर्वहन्नयम् ।
त्विषि कोटिसूर्यनिचयस्तदा भयादवलोकितश्चिरमहो वधूजनैः ॥ ४० ॥
स्वमहोभरादिव सरोजिनीपतिं दिवि भीतिसंकुचिततेजसं पुरः ।
अनिमेषमेव महिपोऽवलोकयन्नयमस्तवीदथ गिरार्जवस्पृशा ॥ ४१ ॥
प्रणवाधिवासितमिदं प्रभो त्विषां तव बिम्बमावसति यत्तदादिमम् ।
उदिति त्रयीविदुपलालितं महः कमलेक्षणं जयति काञ्चनाकृति ॥४२॥
अभिवृष्य भूमिममितौषधीं करैरभिवर्ध्य चेन्दुमधिकामृतं सृजन् ।
अनिशं हविर्भिरमृतैस्तथा भवान्सुरलोकमर्क नयते सुभिक्षताम् ॥ ४३ ॥
सकृदाहिताश्वनहनं सदा रथी तनुषे सुरक्षितिधरप्रदक्षिणम् ।
फलमस्य रात्रिदिनभागवेदनं मिहिरास्य च श्रुतिमितक्रियार्जनम् ॥४४॥
अखिलां त्रयीमुदहरद्विचिन्त्य यं महिदेवभावजनकं मनुं विधिः ।
अमुना त्रिसंध्यमपि किं त्विषां विभो भवता विना हतिपरोऽभिवन्द्यताम् ॥
जगतः स्वयं भजसि यश्चराचरद्वितयीमयस्य दिननेतरात्मताम् ।
परमं त्वमेव स महः परे सुरा भवतो विभूतिपरमाणवो न किम् ॥ ४६ ॥
अनुमासमिन्दुमतिभास्वरं करैरपि पावकं निशि निशि प्रकल्पयन् ।
महसां विभो मम महोभिरुज्ज्वलैरपि भूतलं निखिलमावृतं क्रियाः ॥४७॥
इति कैश्चिदेनमिनमुक्तिनामकैः ससुमैश्चिरेण समपूजयत्प्रभुः ।
फलसाधनैकपटुभिर्महागमप्रथितैः सदालिपरिशीलनोचितैः ॥ ४८ ॥
शशिमौलिमाधवसदार्चनाविधिप्रसितद्विजप्रकरवेदभासुरम् ।
पुरतः स्थितं स सुरपूजनागृहं रघुनाथभूमिरमणः समासदत् ॥ ४९ ॥
मृगनाभिचन्द्रघुसृणादिमिश्रितैर्नवचन्दनैरजनि नैकजातिभिः ।
प्रसवैश्च यत्प्रतिदिनं सुरार्चनास्वविविक्तभेदगुणसौरभावृतम् ॥ ५० ॥
द्विजवेदघोषणवितीर्णया न किं प्रबभौ यदप्रतिहतं प्रतिश्रुता ।
बहुधावकर्णनवलोपश्लीलितं तमुदीरयत्किमु तदानतिक्रमम् ॥ ५१ ॥

सततस्थितत्रिपुरशत्रुशेखरद्युतिभिर्विधूततिमिरे यदन्तरे ।
वयमादृता इति ववल्गुरुच्चकैस्तपनीययष्टिततिषु प्रदीपिकाः ॥ ५२ ॥

व्यजवीजनानिलचलं वरागरुप्रभवं व्यतत बहु धूममण्डलम् ।
परितोऽपि यत्र पटुभिर्भृशं मणिद्युतिभिर्महाभयधुरं भ्रमत्तमः ॥ ५३ ॥

त्रिविधोपचारकृतित्रिश्रुतैर्द्विजैर्हरिशंकरौ विधिवदर्चितौ पुरा ।
अवनीं स्पृशन्नवयवैर्यथोचितं रघुनाथभूमिरमणोऽभ्यवन्दत ॥ ५४ ॥

अयमुत्थितो नृपतिरादरात्पुरो रघुवीरतामधिगतं रमाविभुम् ।
वचनैर्दशावतरवैभवाञ्चितैश्चिरमस्तवीदथ शिरोधृताञ्जलिः ॥ ५५ ॥

अनुवर्णमब्धिकुहरेऽमरद्विषा शिथिलीकृताः सुचिरमादिमा गिरः ।
त्वरितं विचेतुमनसा त्वया धृता जलनिर्निमेषझषभूमिका विभो ॥ ५६ ॥

असुरद्रुतैः पुरहरस्य सैन्धवैरधिसिन्धुदेशमुपबाडवं स्थितम् ।
इति तान्विदन्ननिमिषेन्द्र तत्पदैर्विचरन्पथाङ्कनभृता त्वमाहरः ॥ ५७ ॥

अनिमेषतां चिरमवाप्य वारिधेर्जठरे कुहापि पतिता जरद्गवी ।
उदहारि तूर्णमुपरि त्वया ततो भवतु स्थिरा वृषपरम्परेति किम् ॥ ५८ ॥

निभृतं विभो त्वयि निरन्तरं न किं कमठाकृतौ जयति कल्पितासिका ।
युतचक्रवालधरयोगपट्टिका वसुधा समाधिवशगेव योगिनी ॥ ५९ ॥

अवनेस्त्वयाधिकरणेन भूयते तव चाणुना भजनधन्यचेतसा ।
इति चिन्तयामि कमठेश्वरान्यथा क्रमसे न संकुचितगात्रमात्मनि ॥ ६० ॥

अधिष्ठपीठमनिशं तथा कथं क्षितिरुह्यते न कमठ क्षिता त्वया ।
अधिकं सपद्मधरिता यथानया कमलालया हृदयकल्पितस्थितिः ॥ ६१ ॥

पतिता बलादनुपयोधि दंष्ट्रया किटिरूपिणो मम मही कृतव्यथा ।
बहिरुद्धृताविति सदा वहस्यमूमधिपृष्ठमादिकमठ त्वमादरात् ॥ ६२ ॥

अनतिस्फुटां स्ववसनावगुण्ठमादवनिं कुतोऽपि कुपिताहंभूमिकाम् ।
उपरि श्रियोऽपि हृदयोचितस्थितेरधिदंष्ट्रमादिमकिटे त्वमातनोः ॥ ६३ ॥

जठरं प्रविश्य जलधेर्हतामरद्विषता जवेन किटिवेषपोषिणा ।
तलवर्तिपङ्कलवधारमादरादधिदंष्ट्रमीश भवताऽवनी धृता ॥ ६४ ॥

महिदार एव महिदारतां पुनः प्रकटीकरोतु वपुषा भवान्पुरः ।
अभजत्कथं सुरहरिर्निसर्गतो नृहरित्वमीश भुवि नीतिगर्हितम् ॥ ६५ ॥

अवहन्त शात्रवभुजान्तरारं न किमायतं दलयितुं नखानि ते ।
कुटिलानि वज्रमयकुञ्चिकात्मतां नयतो जवेन नरसिंहतां वपुः ॥ ६६ ॥

दलितं पुरा हृदयमट्टहासतो दनुजेशितुर्दलयितुं वयं पुनः ।
प्रसिता दशापि परमित्यवाङ्मुखा नखरा ह्रियेव नरसिंह तेऽभवन् ॥ ६७ ॥

जठरं स्वभक्तजनकं विदारितं कथमात्मभिः सपदि कर्कशैः रिपोः ।
इति चिन्तया नरहरे ह्रियापि ते नतमौलयः किमभवन्नखाङ्कुराः ॥ ६८ ॥

कठिनं समग्ररणकण्डु वासवं द्विषतो हृदादि हरिणा विना घृणाम् ।
नखराङ्कुरैर्विनतकोटिभिर्दृढैरुदलेखि किं विदलनोपधैस्त्वया ॥ ६९ ॥

त्रिपदीमिताप्यधिप दीयते त्वया जगती यदीयमधुना जगत्त्रयी ।
इह संगतोऽस्मि विबुधेन्द्रचोदनादिति दैत्यवञ्चक वचस्तवैधत ॥ ७० ॥

भवते पदक्रमपरोक्षगानि मे बहुवेदिनः परमहर्षमञ्जसा ।
कलयेयुरिष्टमुपकल्पयेत्यलं बलिवञ्चने तव बभूव भाषितम् ॥ ७१ ॥

बलिवञ्चके कपटवामनाकृतौ भवति त्वयीति जगति प्रथाभवत् ।
बत वामनेन सहवासवैशसात्प्रतिरोधिनापि पथि धावनं वरम् ॥ ७२ ॥

अपराजहंसगतिरात्मना बलादजनि क्षमेत्यनुशयेन तां पुनः ।
भृगुवीरदारितहिरण्यनाभजः सहसानयः किमु सराजहंसताम् ॥ ७३ ॥

अनुशिष्य भूतलमशेषमेककः स्वभुजप्रतापवशवर्ति कः परः ।
बत तत्सुतेन भवता भृगोर्विना महितामदान्निजमखस्य दक्षिणाम् ॥ ७४ ॥

स्वभुजोदिताप्यजनि संततिर्हता भवतेति विस्मयपदं न तद्यतः ।
अवधि प्रसूरपि तथापि पावनी स्थितिरित्यदः श्रयति चित्रतां पुनः ॥ ७५ ॥

विकृतात्मना कपटतो विजित्य भूरमराहितप्रभुमयाच्यतेति किम् ।
असकृद्विमाथितनृपान्वयो महीमखिलामदाद्भृगुसुतस्ततो भवान् ॥ ७६ ॥

असकृन्निहत्य भुवि राजमण्डलीमखिलां त्वया भृगुसुतेन गौरवम् ।
परिचिन्त्य खण्डपरशुः स केवलं रचितोऽजनिष्ट बत राजशेखरः ॥ ७७ ॥

दलिते त्वया गिरिशधन्वनि क्षितिं श्वनिभिश्चलां द्रुतममंसत प्रजाः ।
बत तद्गुणत्वभयकम्प्रगूढपाद्विभुमस्तकस्थितिवितीर्णदुर्दशाम् ॥ ७८ ॥
स्वनृपान्वयद्विषति शस्त्रपाटवं कृतवानितीव गिरिशस्य कार्मुकम् ।
दलयन्पराजितममुं ततो भवान्कुलघातिनं रघुवर क्रुधा व्यधात् ॥ ७९ ॥
विपिनानि मातृवचसा विभो भजन्निजमातृवाक्यनियतो यतो भवान् ।
अधिभार्गवं किमकरोत्स्वमातरं हतवन्तमत्रिदशदेशवर्तिनम् ॥ ८० ॥
निहता प्रसूर्गुरुनियोगतः पुरेत्ययशो गतं गुरुजनापकारिणा ।
वचसा विमातुरपि वैभवं भुवो भवतो विहाय बत गच्छतो वनम् ॥ ८१ ॥
शरणागतेष्वभिरतिस्तवात्मनोऽप्यधिकेत्यसूचि भवतावनीभुवः ।
अभिरक्ष्य वायसमनिष्टमंशुमत्तनयाहितं च विदलय्य वालिनम् ॥ ८२ ॥
स्फटिकान्तरग्निमिव भास्वतो महः प्रतिबिम्बितं तव विभो पराक्रमम् ।
हनुमत्यजीजनदहो यदन्वयव्यतिरेकितेव वहति प्रमाणताम् ॥ ८३ ॥
अमहीचरत्वनियतेऽमरप्रभावकोर्णितां दशमुखस्य तन्वतः ।
दलनात्पुरैव दयया विभो व्यधास्त्वमहो कथं नु खरदूषणक्षिपाम् ॥ ८४ ॥
अखिलं जगद्गतमजीवनं भवेदिति लोकबन्धुजननेश्वर त्वया ।
अतिवेलकोपविषयोऽपि नार्णवः स्वशरैरशोषि मुखसंभृताग्निभिः ॥ ८५ ॥
रघुवंशरत्न लवणोदमाग्रहेऽप्यभिलक्ष्य शोषकशराग्निवैशसात् ।
लवणप्रचाररहितं तलं क्षितेरनुजात्मना कथमहो भवान्व्यधात् ॥ ८६ ॥
दशकण्ठमात्मजनितामरेन्द्र दुर्दशकं वरेण कुरुते स्म यस्त्वया ।
विनिहत्य तस्य नु विधेस्तमस्त्वतो रघुनन्दनेन रचिता विडम्बना ॥ ८७ ॥
अखिलान्दिशामधिपतीन्विजित्य यो दशकंधरो व्यतपत त्वमेषु तम् ।
समवर्तिनः ससुतमाश्रवं बलादकरोस्तवाद्भुतकरो हि साधिमा ॥ ८८ ॥
निजसेवको कपिनिशाचरेश्वरौ प्रभुतां नयन्प्रथमतः स्वयं ततः ।
प्रभुरस्ति यः स्म स भवान्दयानिधे रघुवीर मे दिशतु राज्यमूर्जितम् ॥ ८९ ॥
जनने यदोरमहिराजतोचिते जनिरध्यभूत्तव तथोपकारिणी ।
अवनीभरापनयनं यथाकथाः परिवर्जितस्वपरपक्षचिन्तनम् ॥ ९० ॥

मथितैककार्जुनमदं सुतं भृगोरतिशय्य केलिगलितार्जुनद्वयः ।
समरे त्वमर्जुनसपक्षतां पुनः कथमातनोः कथय नन्दनन्दन ॥ ९१ ॥

अपसारथित्वमवलोक्य यत्नतः समरेऽत्रजीजपत शक्रसूनुना ।
यदरीन्मुहुर्यदुपते पुरा भवानिह हेतुरिन्द्रसहजत्वमेव ते ॥ ९२ ॥

निजभक्तपार्थरथसारथिर्भवान्निखिलान्रिपून्यदमुना व्यजापयत् ।
अधुना मयापि तदये विभो मनोरथसारथिः सपदि जापयत्वमून् ॥ ९३ ॥

अपकृष्य यौवनमपालयद्व्रजे प्रमदासु काममतिबालकोऽपि यः ।
भवतो यदुप्रवर तस्य किं न तद्वद कामपालसहवासिताकृतम् । ९४ ॥

व्रजयौवतस्य वसनानि निर्घृणं विजने हृतान्यनवयन्विभो त्वया ।
वसितांशुकां कुरुवरप्रियां व्यधाः सदसीत्यबोधि सरलं जनः कथम् ॥ ९५ ॥

भवतोऽपि कृष्ण सबलं प्रयत्नतो नरकच्छिदो युधि न किं वदाधिकाः ।
प्रसितास्त्वदङ्घ्रिभजनैरयत्नतो धुतनैकभेदनरकाः स्वतो यतः ॥ ९६ ॥

सुममेकमेव सुदृशा पुरार्थितं भवता व्यतारि बत दैवतस्तरुः ।
अभिवाञ्छितादधिकमद्य मे ततस्त्वमुपाहर त्वरितमीश वैभवम् ॥ ९७ ॥

अवनेश्चिरादपनिनीषुणा भरं निखिला हता निरवशेषमात्मना ।
इति चिन्तयेव सुगतत्वमेयुषा भवतातिकारुणिकता प्रकाशिता ॥ ९८

षडभिज्ञ भोः सकलशून्यवादिनां गुरुरेव साधु कुरुषे स्म दूषणम् ।
बत सर्वतन्त्रपरतत्त्वरूपया सकलात्मकस्य तव सत्तयानया ॥ ९९ ॥

रुषितेन निश्वसितरोधिनोऽखिलश्रुतिदूषणेन सुलभेतरौजसः ।
यवनान्निहन्तुमनसा यतिष्यते कलिसंक्षये जगति कल्किना त्वया ॥ १०० ॥

सुगतात्मना श्रुतिरदूष्यत त्वयेत्ययशो यदास तदपाकरिष्यसि ।
सकलत्रयीविधिसमापकान्खलान्युगपन्निहत्य युधि कल्किविग्रहः ॥

वदनोदितैर्ध्वनिरसप्रसन्नतामधुरस्वभावमहितैर्मणीचकैः ।
अमृतासवप्रसवशेखरं क्षितेरयमार्चयत्तदनु देवमीश्वरः ॥ १०२ ॥

अभिकाय शैलदुहितुर्निशाधिभूशुभिकाय सर्वविबुधाधिकाय ते ।
मलयाद्रिगुप्तवलयाय मौनिहृन्निलयाय देव कलयामि वन्दनाम् ॥ १०३

कलयानिशं शिरसि भूषितं महः कलयानि किंचन यदिष्टदेवताम् ।
सहजानि तत्परिहरिष्यति ध्रुवं सहजानि दुष्परिहराण्यघानि मे ॥ १०४ ॥

भव तेजसा शमितमृत्युना नमो भवते जनान्स्वगुणवन्दिनोऽवते ।
भसिता यतादरवशेन वर्ष्मणा भसिताय शश्वदपि शोणरूपिणे ॥ १०५ ॥

चतुराननादिबुधवन्दिताङ्घ्रये चतुराय भक्तजनपोषणेऽनिशम् ।
प्रभवेन वैशसजुषो नमांसि मे प्रभवे नगेन्द्रजनुषो भवन्तु ते ॥ १०६ ॥

भवतः कलां शिरसि यां नदीजलभ्रमघूर्णितां सकलमिन्दुमुल्लिखन् ।
प्रविविक्षतीव करशम्बरस्तया भवतापमाशु भव मे व्यपोहय ॥ १०७ ॥

द्वितयान्यदृष्टिविभवा त्वयि प्रभो शरणागताः षडपि ये सदा द्विषः ।
शमयन्ति कामसहितान्भवन्ति ते तव काममात्रजयिनः स्वतोऽधिकाः ॥

गरलं महद्ग्लपितसर्वविष्टपं गलभूषणं वितनुते भवानतः ।
सुरदीर्घजीवननिदानमौषधीवरशल्कमस्ति शिरसीति चिन्तये ॥ १०९ ॥

गरलं मुहुर्ग्लपितबाह्यविष्टपं नियतं भवान्निजगले नियच्छति ।
जठरान्तरस्थितचराचरव्यथाशमनाय हन्त शमनान्तक प्रभो ॥ ११० ॥

विधिमाधवाविदितमस्तकाङ्घ्रिरप्यलमल्पभक्तनुतिमानसाश्रयः ।
अपि हन्त वाङ्मनसयोरगोचरो हर कीदृशी तव वदान्यवस्थता ॥ १११ ॥

परशुः स्वभक्तभरणे सपावकः करयोर्यतः शपथकर्मणे धृतः ।
प्रसितं मृकण्डुभवसंहृतौ ततो हर यत्नतो यममुमारयद्भवान् ॥ ११२ ॥

द्वितयात्परा महति देव तेऽलिके हृदये च दृष्टिरतनुर्हृतः कया ।
प्रथमं तवेति विशयं पराकरोष्यनिशं त्रपामुकुल्यानयालिके ॥ ११३ ॥

स्वविनाशितं स्मरमजीवयत्पुनस्तव वामलोचनमिति त्रपावशात् ।
निटिलस्थमीक्षणमभून्निमीलितं सततं वधूपुरुषसंगतात्मनः ॥ ११४ ॥

हर यत्पुरा युधि हसो महौजसो दितिजान्पुरत्रितयवासिनो बहून् ।
तृणतूलदाहमधिकं ददाह तद्गलगुप्ततीक्ष्णगरसाह्यचेष्टितम् ॥ ११५ ॥

तनयद्रुहे जनकदारिणेऽपि ते शरणागताय दिशतः सरूपताम् ।
यजति स्मरन्य इह देवतान्तरं धरचाप तस्य हि तदेव शिक्षणम् ॥११६॥

गोचरोऽपि वचसामगोचरः पावनोऽपि जगतामपावनः ।
अन्तकोऽप्यघवतामनन्तकः कस्तव स्तवविधिक्रमक्षमः ॥ ११७ ॥

संपादितान्यपि मुरारिशरादिमानि चन्द्रावतंस विजहद्युधि साधनानि ।
तिस्रः पुरस्त्वमदहस्तृणतूलदाहं हासेन येन स तवादिशदुन्नतत्वम् ॥

बृन्दारकेषु यदि कोऽपि भिनत्ति मूल्यं
जायेत वा यदि न जातु जगत्यमुष्मिन् ।
साम्यं बिभर्तु स तदा तव चन्द्रमौले
भग्नास्त्वहंकृतिरतो भवतोऽभिवृद्धा ॥ ११९ ॥

हालाहलं हर नियम्य परानियाम्यं
सर्वान्बुधान्सपदि यः स्वनतानरक्षत् ।
दक्षानशिक्षत पुनर्युधि दक्षयज्ञे
तानेषु कोऽपि तव तस्य कथं समः स्यात् ॥ १२० ॥

आख्याति चेत्स्वमनिदंप्रथमत्वमेवमापादलम्बि हर धातृकरोटिदाम ।
अन्यस्य सोऽयमपि ते सदृशस्तदा स्यादाद्योऽहमेव जगतीत्यनृतोऽभिमानः ॥

अलोकदृष्ट्या विजितोऽभवन्मया स्मरः पुरेति स्मरता त्वया पुनः ।
तनुश्रियाप्येष जितस्तपोवने मुनिस्त्रियस्तद्विमुखा हि मोहिताः ॥ १२२ ॥

न्यग्रोधमूलवसतिर्यमिषु प्रभाव्य नाथ प्रबोधमथ तान्कुरुषे विमुक्तान् ।
इत्यादिमं वचनमीरयति द्विजं त्वां देवेषु मामुपदिश त्वमतो विबोधम् ॥

आदौ पाणिनिना त्वमक्षरसमाम्नायोपदेशेन यः
शब्दानामनुशासनान्यकलयः शास्त्रेण सूत्रात्मना ।
भाष्यं तस्य च पादहंसकरवैः प्रौढाशयं तं गुरुं
शब्दार्थप्रतिपत्तिहेतुमनिशं चन्द्रावतंसं भजे ॥ १२४ ॥

अज्ञातप्रभवैर्वचोभिरखिलैरालम्बि धर्मप्रमा-
हेतुत्वं विविधाध्वरक्रमकृतिष्वेकायनैश्चोदनैः ।
तेषामध्वरकर्मणामधिपतिं त्वामीश नाराध्नुव-
न्धर्मानिर्जयितुं न शक्ष्यति जनो दक्षोऽप्यदक्षोऽथ वा ॥ १२५ ॥

सव्यङ्गं भुजगोपवीतवहनात्साशङ्कमन्याङ्गतः
साकूतस्मितफुल्लगल्लफलकं स्पृष्ट्वा समाश्वासयत् ।
तत्संस्पर्शवशेन जातपुलकं त्वं मानसे तन्महः
सामानाधिकरण्यधाम जयसि स्त्रैणस्य पौंस्नस्य च ॥ १२६ ॥

हर्षं दक्षिणवामभागकरयोरन्योन्यमाश्लेषणा-
देष्यन्तं भुजयोर्द्वयी कथयते यस्य स्फुरन्ती स्फुटम् ।
प्रायस्ताण्डवलास्यकर्मनिपुणौ पादौ यदीयौ समं
भूमा त्वं निरतस्तपोधनमनोभूमावसौ राजसे ॥ १२७ ॥

व्यत्यस्तात्मीयपार्श्वद्वयमधिमुकुरं स्वस्य वीक्ष्यानुबिम्बं
यो जानन्नूनमन्यां निजतनुमुपयुक्तान्यपार्श्वद्वयीकाम् ।
अद्याश्लेषं ममेयं वितरति बहुधेत्यन्तरानन्दजातै-
र्हासैर्हृष्यत्कपोलो विभवसि भगवानर्धनारीश्वरस्त्वम् ॥ १२८ ॥

इत्थंकारमनेकवारमवनेरीशो गिरां कन्दलैः
स्तुत्वा सिन्धुसुतापतिं शशिकलाचूडं तथा भक्तिमान् ।
आशीर्भिः स पुरस्कृतः क्षितिसुरैराम्नायविद्याकरैः
प्रौढश्रीरभिषेकमण्डपमभिप्रस्थातुमैच्छन्मुदा ॥ १२९ ॥

परिचिन्त्य पयोनिधिस्थितां यदुनेतुर्नगरीमिवोत्तमाम् ।
रघुनाथ समुद्रवर्तिनीं रचय द्वारवतीं च दक्षिणाम् ॥ १३० ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपु-
प्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।
कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो
जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥ १३१ ॥

श्रीगोविन्दमखीन्दुवंशमणिना श्रीयज्ञनारायणा-
भिख्येनाध्वरिणा कृते मधुसुधारोधाय मेधाविना ।
जातो दत्तसुचित्तनिर्वृतिदशः सर्गोऽयमेकादश-
स्तत्राकद्वदविद्वदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ १३२ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-
चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्याप्तवाजपेययाजि-
गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-
याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ
साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये
एकादशः सर्गः ।

द्वादशः सर्गः ।

संभारपूर्णमभिषेकचतुष्कमस्मिन्प्रस्थातुमुद्यतवति क्षितिपालमौलौ ।
आनेष्ट पुष्यरथमेकमथाधिरोहयोग्यं सुयुक्तहयगोयुगमाशु सूतः ॥ १ ॥

गाङ्गेयचित्रधुरमात्तकशाकसूतसंनाहिताश्वयुगलं समवृत्तचक्रम् ।
सोल्लोचमध्यधि विटङ्कतटं कृतेन शोभावता मणिगणैः शिखरेण युक्तम् ॥

राज्याभिषेकसमये रघुनाथनेतुरासादितं सुचिरमस्य पुरीजनानाम् ।
सिद्धं मनोरथमिव श्रियमावहन्तं वीथीमुखे विविधचित्रवितानरम्ये ॥ ३ ॥

भूमीरथैः प्रतिपदं पुरवीथिकासु क्लृप्तैः समत्र कृतदर्पणपङ्क्तिरूपैः ।
अक्ष्णां शतैः कुतुकतः परितोऽनिमेषं निर्वर्ण्यतेऽयमिति निश्चितमध्वनीनैः ॥

सौरभ्यमाशु सुमतोरणदामपङ्क्तेः सारं हरन्ति मधुपा वियति भ्रमन्तः ।
इत्युद्धतैर्ध्वजपटैरिव राजधानी वीथीमुखे मुहुरमून्विनिवारयन्तम् ॥ ५ ॥

वीथीपथे नृपजनैर्विरजीकृतेऽस्मिन्धूलीभरान्कुसुमतोरणवल्लयः स्वान् ।
त्यक्त्वालिनां पदतलैः प्रहता भवन्ति हन्तेति मौक्तिकरुचेव हसन्तमुच्चैः ॥

धूलीभरेषु सुमतोरणविच्युतेषु सद्यस्तदासवभरैः शमितेष्वथापि ।
सिक्तं हिमैर्नृपतिसेविभिरादरेण वीथीतलं विलसितं विदधानमुच्चैः ॥ ७ ॥

हर्म्येषु रत्नखचितेष्वभितः स्वकीयान्याधाय साधु शतशोऽप्यनुबिम्बनानि ।
राज्यावनाय निरते रघुनाथभूपे पुष्यन्मनोरथशतं पुरमावहन्तम् ॥ ८ ॥

श्रौतक्रमान्विभजता स्वपुरोहितेन नान्दीमुखं प्रतिसरं स नरेन्द्रचन्द्रः ।
राज्याभिषेचनकृते रचयन्विधेयं हर्षेण पुष्यरथमेनमथाध्यरुक्षत् ॥ ९ ॥

रथ्यौ विमुक्तधृतरश्मि ततः प्रतोदं व्यापारयन्निजकरेण वलत्कशेन ।
युक्तौ स पुष्यरथहेमयुगे नृपेण संचोदितः सपदि चालयति स्म सूतः ॥

रथ्याधिकस्यदवशेन रथाङ्गयुग्मनेमिभ्रमिप्रविसरन्निजरेणुदम्भात् ।
आचन्द्रतारकमसौ वहते पुरा मामित्येनमीक्षितुमिव क्षितिरुत्थितासीत् ॥

रथ्यापथे स्म चिरमस्ति रथस्य चारः
सद्यस्तथा मनुजचन्द्रमसाश्रितस्य ।
विद्वेषिणां महिभुजां विधुता यथा स्या-
न्मार्गे गतिर्जगति हन्त मनोरथानाम् ॥ १२ ॥

रथ्यां प्रसाधयति पुष्यरथेन दीप्त्या
रत्नाविभोरपि वरे रघुनाथभूपे ।
एणीदृशामथ तदीक्षणकाङ्क्षिणीनां
कोलाहलः सपदि कोऽप्यधिसौधमासीत् ॥ १३ ॥

प्रासादपङ्क्तिरुच्चत्प्रमदाभिराशु भूयो गवाक्षविवरैः स्फुटितारुरोकैः ।
द्रष्टुं समस्तमपि पौरजनप्रकर्षमक्ष्णां शतैरिव मुदा सहितानिमेषैः ॥

धूपा नवागरुभवा धुरि जालकेभ्यो
रथ्यापथाद्विविधवाद्यरवाः पुरा वा ।
व्याप्तास्तदेति विशयेन विशां विनैव
व्यापन्समं सकलमाशु दिशावकाशम् ॥ १५ ॥

लाजाः सुमान्यपि मुहुर्ललनाजनेन हर्षादवर्षिषत हर्म्यजुषा नृपाले ।
पौरश्रिया स्वरमणे परिणीतयेऽस्मिन्नाद्रीक्षता इव शिरस्यवकीर्यमाणाः ॥

काचित्पुरो महिशतक्रतुनन्दनेन वीथी व्यलङ्घ्यत परं न विशां ततोऽनु ।
प्रासाजनिष्ट विशिखापि विलोभनीया नानापणेषु निचितैर्नवरत्नसंघैः ॥

वैश्यालयप्रचुरवज्रगवाक्षमार्गादाहृत्य वायुरगरूद्भवसौरभाणि ।
यत्नादृतेऽवलत यत्र सुवासिताङ्गान्पान्थान्सदापि रचयन्परिरम्भणेन ॥

क्रय्यैर्लसन्ति सुदृशः स्म कथं न बृन्दैः
पुण्ड्रेक्षुभिः सुमनसामपि पुष्टभृङ्गैः ।
स्वालोकमात्रजनुषां स्मरसंततीनां
यस्यां जयप्रहरणैरिव दीयमानैः ॥ १९ ॥

नानामणीहरिणनाभिमधुद्रवाद्यैः क्रय्यैर्यदर्यसुदृशः क्रयिकान्पदार्थैः ।
वाक्यैर्विदग्धरचनैरपि वञ्चयित्वा सर्वेन्द्रियाण्यवशयन्त सुखेन कन्तोः ॥

पूपा नवाज्यपिठरोदरपच्यमानाः
स्वैः सौरभैः सिमिसिमारवसाह्यभव्यैः ।
घ्राणेन्द्रियाभिलषितं कथमध्वगानां
शश्वन्न यत्र विदधुः श्रवणैकसाक्षि ॥ २१ ॥

वाचाललोहवलयैः पथि वैश्यडिम्भाः पान्थेषु पाणिपिठरीभरितानपूपान् ।
आवेदयन्त परमात्तगता यदन्तः पौरेषु तत्परिमलाः परितोऽखिलेषु ॥ २२ ॥

गोधूमपिष्टकलनालघुघूर्ण्यमाननानाघरट्टकटुनादकरम्बितापि ।
आस्वादलोभसृणिकाभिवलद्रसज्ञं या सौरभैः कुतुकमेव जने वितेने ॥

वैश्येषु केचन महीपतिवर्यमेनं वृद्धाः समेत्य विनयेन वृता वधूभिः ।
नव्यैर्मुहुर्मुहुरथो नवरत्नसंघैर्हर्षादहंप्रथमिकागममभ्यषिञ्चन् ॥ २४ ॥

वैश्यालयप्रचुरवैभवसाक्षिणीं तां वीथीं विलङ्घ्य स ततोऽनु विवामधीशः ।
अन्यामपि स्वरथचक्रपरिक्रमेण धन्यामसाधयत वारवधूनिवासम् ॥ २५ ॥

मोचायुगान्यनुगृहप्रतिहारदेशं भूतानि तत्र बभुरुत्पललोचनानाम् ।
वक्तुं स्थितानि किममुष्य वसुंधरेन्दोः सद्यस्तदूरुकलितस्वविभापहारम् ॥

तामिन्दुबन्धुवदनास्तरसाभितोऽपि प्रासादपङ्क्तिषु गताः प्रतिभूमिभागम् ।
अम्लानमभ्रमरपादहतं कटाक्षैर्नीलाब्जतोरणशतं निबिडं बबन्धुः ॥ २७ ॥

आकारसौष्ठवलवानुकृतेरदोतमागस्त्रसन्महिवलासुहृदात्मजस्य ।
चेतांसि सारसदृशां स्वदमानधन्वा तत्रोपहत्य तरसा युगपन्निरास ॥ २८ ॥

मग्नान्यहो महिभृतो महति प्रभाणां
तस्या झरे समधिकं तरुणीमनांसि ।
कामं प्रतारकतया कथितोऽपि भूयो
भूयो न्यमज्जयत पुण्ड्रलताशरासः ॥ २९ ॥

प्रायेण तत्र नृपतेर्भ्रमितैः पुरस्ता-
त्कर्पूरदीपनिकरैः कलभाषिणीभिः ।
दूष्यावनीविभुमहांसि दिनप्रदीप-
च्छायानि बभ्रमुरहो स्वत एव सद्यः ॥ ३० ॥

वीथीमिमामपि स वारविलासिनीनामुल्लङ्घ्य भूपतनुभूरुदितप्रमोदः ।
हैमं चतुष्कमगमत्समया सवेगं पट्टाभिषेककरणाय परिष्कृतं तत् ॥ ३१ ॥
पट्टाभिषेचनकृते प्रमदेन तूर्णमभ्यर्णमागतममुं सुतमच्युतेन्द्रः ।
गोविन्दयज्वमणिना कुलमन्त्रिणायं प्रत्युज्जगाम पुरतः प्रचलत्पुरोधाः ॥ ३२ ॥
अभ्युद्गतं जनकमच्युतभूपमेनं गोविन्दयज्वसहितं कुशलः श्रुतेषु ।
आलोकयन्सपदि पुष्यरथादथायं हर्षादवातरदथो रघुनाथभूपः ॥ ३३ ॥
पित्राच्युतक्षितिभृता रघुनाथभूमीपाकाहितः प्रकृतिभिः परितः परीतः ।
पट्टाभिषेचनकृते प्रसितं चतुष्कं हर्षेण सादरमनीयत हैममेतत् ॥ ३४ ॥
उन्मेषकारि भुवि भास्वर उर्वरेन्द्रोरुद्वेलभोगमिदमित्युदधिर्नभोगम् ।
उन्मेषयन्रविविधू किमुपागतोऽभूद्यत्राहृताम्बुनिभतः समुदीक्षणाय ॥ ३५ ॥
आत्माभिकाश्रयदुराग्रहभूभृदोघजेता महीवलजिदेष विभात्यमुष्मिन् ।
इत्येनमीक्षितुमिव क्षितिलोकनाथं यत्राहृताम्बुवपुषा सरितः समेयुः ॥
छेत्तुर्विभोरपुनरुत्थिति शार्वराणां यत्रोदयं जिगमिषोर्महसीव दार्ढ्यम् ।
अध्येतुमर्कशशिनौ सरिदम्बुपूर्णसौवर्णरौप्यकलशच्छलतः स्म भातः ॥
नक्षत्रसंततिमहांसि नरेन्दुरेष यस्मिन्सदापि सहितेति वचः स्वनिष्ठम् ।
तारा विबुध्य नु वितानपटावलम्बिमुक्तामणीकपटतो मुहुराश्रयन्त ॥ ३८ ॥
सा चन्द्रिका भुवमिता स्वयमर्कभीत्या
प्रायेण पुष्यति वितानपटात्मनेदम् ।
हर्षाद्विवेति यदधीश्वरमिन्दुरेन-
माह्लादकत्वमनयन्निजमादरेण ॥ ३९ ॥
सर्वोन्नतोऽप्यहमसंसि सदाशिवेन प्रागित्यमर्त्यशिखरी प्रबलो भविष्यन् ।
आचन्द्रतारकमधीशितुरस्य यत्र भद्रासनं मणिमयं किमु पर्यणंसीत् ॥ ४० ॥
यत्राङ्कुरार्पणमकारि यथावदादौ भूमीसुरैर्न परमागमबोधधन्यैः ।
वर्णाश्रमस्थितिविभागवदावदेन धर्माङ्कुरार्पणमनेन धराभृतापि ॥ ४१ ॥
पट्टाभिषेचनमुदं पवमानबालो यत्नान्निरीय महिपस्य यदन्तरालात् ।
अत्यादरेण वितरन्हुतहव्यगन्धाञ्जोद्घुष्यते स्म पटहस्वनतो जनानाम् ॥ ४२ ॥

औदुम्बरे मणिगणाञ्चितभर्मपट्टसंवर्मिते स्वजनकेन स भद्रपीठे ।
शार्दूलचर्मविहितास्तरणे नियुक्तस्तस्मिन्न्यविक्षत ततो रघुनाथभूपः ॥ ४३ ।
भद्रासने निवसतः प्रथिते मणीभिः साम्यं तदा परममुष्य समाश्रयिष्यत् ।
शृङ्गे पतिः स महसामधिरत्नसानु तुङ्गे कदापि यदि तोषवशादुदैष्यत् ॥
सर्वौषधैर्दधिमधुद्रवसंभृतैस्तमुच्चार्य मन्त्रमुचितं स्वहुतावशेषैः ।
गोशृङ्गकोशनिहिते रघुनाथभूपं गोविन्दयज्वगुरुरभ्यषिचन्मनीषी ॥ ४५ ॥
दूर्वाक्षतप्रसवरत्नसुवर्णपूतैः सर्वाम्बुराशितटिनीसरसां पयोभिः ।
गोविन्दयज्वगुरुणा कुशली स भूयस्तत्राभ्यषिच्यत ततोऽनु पुरोहिताभ्याम् ॥
हर्षेण तं तनुजमच्युतभूवलारिस्त्राभिषिच्य विविधैरुदधेः पयोभिः ।
कन्यागणैर्भटवरैर्गणिकाभिरेनमभ्यभ्यषेचयदयं तदनु क्रमेण ॥ ४७ ॥
वस्त्रद्वयं विभुरवस्त वसुंधरायाः सोऽयं निरङ्कुशशिसोदरमादरेण ।
प्रत्यर्थिदानपटुताप्रभवे समञ्जे स्वं सेवनीयमिव सस्पृहमाश्रयन्त्यौ ॥ ४८ ॥
भद्रासनस्थितिविधिप्रथितं विभूत्या नित्याग्निहोत्रभवया निटिले महीन्दोः ।
आचन्द्रतारकमधीश्वरतानिदानं गोविन्ददीक्षितगुरुः कुरुते स्म पट्टम् ॥ ४९ ॥
बुद्ध्वा मुखेन्दुमनिशं बुधघर्षणेन स्वस्याभिवृद्धतरसर्वकलाविलासम् ।
नन्तुं समागतमधान्नरपालमौलिज्योतिर्गणं मणिकिरीटशरीरभाजम् ॥ ५० ॥
शत्रुं तमो महिपतिः स्वमहोनपोह्यं बाह्यं निरस्यति सदा बहु चक्रवालात् ।
तज्जोभिरित्यहिमदीधितिरस्य पादमाश्लिष्यति स्म मणिहंसकविभ्रमेण ॥
आजानरम्यतरमूर्तिरपि क्षितीन्दुरुत्तेजितस्तरुणिमोदयनेन भूयः ।
भूयोऽप्यधत्त मणिभूषणजालकेन सोऽयं विभूषितवपुः सुषमाविशेषान् ॥
आरक्षितुं कुवलयं कमलानुकूलं हातुं सदाहिभयमप्यमृतांशुरेत्य ।
इन्दुं पटुत्वमवनेरिव याचमानश्छत्रात्मनाध्रियत तं समया जनेन ॥ ५३ ॥
बाह्वोः समं रिपुबलक्षपणैकधाम्नोजीते किमस्य महतो जगतीवलारेः ।
विश्वत्रयं सपदि वीजनलौल्यदम्भाद्द्वे चामरे क्रमितुमुद्यममावहेताम् ॥
सौवर्णकाहलरवैः सहितो जयाङ्कभेरीध्वनिर्दिविषदध्वनि जृम्भमाणः ।
सद्यो महीपतियशःस्थगनैकहेतुं ब्रह्माण्डमावहदिव प्रतिघेन भिन्नम् ॥ ५५ ॥

संभूय तत्र विविधं सविधे विधेयाः सर्वावनीवलयशासनभाग्ययोग्यम् ।
भूमीभुजो नरपुरंदरमेनमेत्य राजोपचारमुचितं रचयांबभूवुः ॥ ९६ ॥

भद्रासनस्थितिरमुष्य परप्रणामविद्यां त्यजन्ति मकुटानि विभुत्वभाजाम् ।
अव्याकृतिश्रममदत्तकशाभिघातमध्याप्य हन्त गुरुतामवलम्बते स्म ॥ ९७ ॥

सिंहासनस्थितिरमुष्य चिरेण बोधदोषान्सदाश्रयणदोषविभागविशेषान् ।
द्वेष्येषु वैभवमहानिलदीनदीनानस्नेहकल्पनमनावृति पर्यपुष्णात् ॥ ९८ ॥

आरोढुरस्य नृपपीठमवापुरङ्घ्र्योः
सोपानतां विनमतां मकुटानि येषाम् ॥
अव्याहतं महिभुजां चिरमंसकूटा-
स्तेषां भुवे स्म वितरन्ति विहारसौख्यम् ॥ ९९ ॥

प्राणंसिषुर्नरपतेः पदयोस्तथास्य भूपाः पदाङ्गदमणीपुषितैर्मयूखैः ।
फालेषु धातृलिखिता निजभाग्यरेखाः सद्यो यथा बभुरिवाञ्जनसारलिप्ताः॥

कालानपेक्षजलपूरकवैरकन्यमस्मिन्नवग्रहदुरासदमभ्रपङ्क्तिः ।
संरक्षति क्षितितलं सकलं नरेन्द्रचन्द्रेऽभ्यवर्षदतिसस्यसमृद्धियोग्यम् ॥ ६१ ॥

भूमीसुरान्मणितुलापुरुषादिमानि दानानि तत्र स महान्ति धरावलारिः ।
नीत्वा जवेन युगपन्निगमागमाढ्यान्हर्षेण पोषयितुमैच्छदथो महेच्छः ॥ ६२ ॥

सर्वावनीन्दुसदृशोक्तिसमर्थनैकतानप्रमाणपदवाक्यतरङ्गिताभिः ।
प्रज्ञाभिरम्बुजजनैरिव मूर्तिभेदा विज्ञा बुधास्तमभजन्विभुमत्युदारम् ॥ ६३ ॥

आचार्यमुख्यवरणाचरणेन तत्सद्मनेषु तानथ महत्सु धरासुधाशान् ।
वेदार्पणैकनिरतान्विधिनाभिपूज्य नेताध्यवीवसदसौ नियतो नृपाणाम् ॥

स्नातः परेद्युरवनीशतमन्युरेष हृष्टः पुरोहितगणैर्हृदि रामभद्रम् ।
ध्यायन्समग्रनवरत्नघटां यथावदारोपितोऽजनि तुलामतुलोऽपि लोके ॥ ६५ ॥

तौल्येऽधिकार इह दैत्यरिपोस्तुलाया
दण्डे स्थितस्य विभुनाप्रतिमात्मना सः ।
मध्यस्थभावमयते मम का कथेति
भूमच्छलादवनतो भुवि रत्नराशिः ॥ ६६ ॥

तुष्यन्नसावथ तुलातुलितानि रत्नान्येभ्यो विभज्य स वितीर्य यथांशमादौ ।
उर्वीसुरेभ्य उचितानि वसूनि भूपो दीनान्धयाचकतते दिशते स्म पश्चात् ॥

आरुह्य काञ्चनतुलामवनीवलारिः स्वर्णं तथा स्म तुलितं ददते द्विजेभ्यः ।
स्वर्णं चिरेण बहुधा निचितं बुधानां सर्वेऽपि ते विकलयन्ति यथा क्षणेन ॥

धैर्येण मेरुमखिलं तुलयन्द्विजेभ्यो
    दातुं समुद्यतमना धरणीबिडौजाः ।
दत्ते स्म हेम स घटे तुलितं तुलाया-
    मित्यस्ति विस्मयमिदं विदुषां कथं स्यात् ॥ ६९ ॥

भास्वति कवौ तुलामधिरूढे रघुनाथभूमिचन्द्रमसि ।
सुमनःकदम्बपुष्टिं स्वर्णस्तोमाभिवृष्टिरातनुत ॥ ७० ॥

सान्द्रश्रीरधिराजवंशमुदितः साम्राज्ययोगे पुरा
    क्रीडाकृत्तसमस्तशत्रुरवनीं केयूरवाहं वहन् ।
भूयोऽप्येत्य हिरण्यगर्भजननं भूत्येकतानं शुभे
    लग्ने प्राभवमेष सर्वजगतीराज्याङ्गमाम्रेडयत् ॥ ७१ ॥

हिरण्यगर्भदानेन भरण्यप्रतिमेन ते ।
धर्माणां विबुधाः शर्म निर्माणामिभ्यतां ययुः ॥ ७२ ॥

विश्वद्वीपमहिप्रदो युधि पुरा वीरो जितः केवलं
    शौर्येणेति विचारयन्रघुपतिः शौर्येण दानेन च ।
जेतुं तं पुनरप्युदेत्य निहतद्वेष्यो द्विजेभ्योऽखिलं
    प्रायः श्रीरघुनाथभूपवपुषा ब्रह्माण्डमेवादिशत् ॥ ७३ ॥

मम देयवस्त्वपि दिशेन्मनीषितं विदुषामनन्यसुलभं स्वतो यदि ।
प्रभवेत्तदा वितरणप्रथा भुवीत्यथ कल्पपादपमिवाददादयम् ॥ ७४ ॥

दत्त्वासौ गोसहस्रं स्मृतिगतमननुष्ठानरूपं निरस्य-
    न्नप्रामाण्यं हविर्भिः क्रतुषु घृतमुखैरत्यनल्पैस्तदीयैः ।
प्रत्येकं हूयमानैः प्रतिमुहुरपि तैः संप्रदानैर्द्विजेन्द्रै-
    र्दुर्भिक्षं देवलोकेष्विति निगममधादप्रमाणं कथं वा ॥ ७५ ॥

कथमेत्र हिरण्यकामधेनुः प्रभुणा सा प्रतिपादिता बुधेभ्यः ।
अदिशद्द्रविणान्ययाचितान्यप्यवधूतामरकामधेनुगर्वम् ॥ ७६ ॥

हिरण्याश्वो दत्तो नृपहिमकरेणोन्नततरः
स्वयं नैव स्थानाच्चलनमपि किंचिद्व्रतत यः ।
ग्रहीतॄणां सद्यो भुवि कथमहो स स्वभजना-
द्बुधानां दारिद्र्यं पुनरगमयत्पारमुदधेः ॥ ७७ ॥

अश्वैर्युतं रथमपारहिरण्यकूटैः सौवर्णमेष वितरन्नपि सार्वभौमः ।
दाक्षिण्यराशिरधिकामथ दक्षिणां च दीनारभूषणगणैर्दिशति स्म सद्यः ॥
हस्तिनं रथमपि क्ष्माधिभूर्र्पयन्नपरितोषतः सताम् ।
हेमहस्तिरथदानमातनोदेष सादरमुदारशेखरः ॥ ७९ ॥

चोलानां समयानपेक्षलहरीसह्यात्मजानां विभुः
स्वं कैदार्यमकृष्टपच्यमखिलं संचिन्त्य सोऽयं मुहुः ।
किं साध्यं भुवि लाङ्गलैरिति सदा कीर्त्यै महत्यै ततो
धात्रीशः किमु पञ्चलाङ्गलमहादानं बुधानां व्यधात् ॥ ८० ॥

अनाहार्यामन्यैरनुशरदमप्यात्मयत्नानुरूपं
सवित्रीं धान्यानां समुदयमयं संततेः स्वापतेयम् ।
अनर्घामाकल्पावधि धुतलयां यच्छतां गृह्णतां च
श्रियं दात्रीं धात्रीं स्थिरमतिरदात्सद्विधेयो बुधेभ्यः ॥ ८१ ॥

संचार्यते हि सुकृतेन मनोरथो मे स्वच्छन्दमग्रथितचक्रमितीह लोके ।
विख्यापयन्निव मणीमयविश्वचक्रदानं महीन्दुरतनिष्ट धरासुराणाम् ॥८२॥

आकारेण विबुध्य याचकगणेष्वाकाङ्क्षितं यच्छतः
साम्यं याचितमात्रदानकुशला सा मे कथं काङ्क्षति ।
इत्युर्वीविलशासनः किमकरोदीर्ष्याजुषा चेतसा
धात्र्यां कल्पलतां निजाश्रितबुधैर्दानेन बन्दीकृताम् ॥ ८३ ॥

आत्मना तुलितमार्पयं भणिस्तोममित्यपरितोषतः पुनः ।
दानकेलिरसिकस्तदाकरान्स स्म किं दिशति सप्त सागरान् ॥ ८४ ॥

रत्नैरनर्घैं रचयन्स धेनुं व्यशिश्रणद्यां वसुधासुधांशुः ।
सा रत्नगर्भा समवाप्य धेनुरूपां समानां ववचे महार्घैः ॥ ८५ ॥

अभीप्सितं याचितमप्ययाचितं सद्यो ददे वस्तु समस्तमर्थिनाम् ।
इतीव गर्भैंधितसर्वविष्टपं भूपो महाभूतघटं सतामदात् ॥ ८६ ॥

रत्नहेमरजतादिमैरसौ मेदुराञ्चिशिखरमेरुपर्वतान् ।
पाण्डराश्वहलपङ्क्तिसिन्धुरान्कालपूरुषमपि क्रमाददात् ॥ ८७ ॥

वारयोगकरणादिदेवतावारयोग्यबहुदानवैभवैः ।
भूसुरान्निगमशास्त्रसाहितीभासुरानपुषदेष पार्थिवः ॥ ८८ ॥

हेमाद्रिकल्पप्रवचनश्रवणेन भूपो हेमाद्रिमेव बत दानभरैरतक्षणोत् ।
धर्मार्जनेषु निरतामपि सूचकानां धात्रीश्वरा भुवि गिरं न किमाद्रियन्ते ॥

अवनीरमणेन यानि दानान्यकृतानि स्मृतयो न तान्यजानन् ।
भुवि ये सुधियोऽप्यपोषितास्तैर्न वलन्ते बत ते नमः शिवाय ॥ ९० ॥

आहूय याचकजनाननुदीतलोभरूक्षोक्ति याचितममीभिररोषलेशम् ।
आकर्णयन्नभिमतादधिकानि वस्तून्यत्यादरादृदिशदेष विशामधीशः ॥ ९१ ॥

अभ्यर्थितादपि वसून्यधिकानि भूयो भूयो दिशन्नपि धुतभ्रुकुटीविकारः ।
अश्लाघनोक्त्यनुदितानुशयं दयालुरालोकते स्म विभुरर्थिजनानवन्याः ॥

आमेरुदक्षिणसरिद्वरमग्रहारस्तोमेन वेदनिधिकोविदसात्कृतेन ।
भूमेर्विधाय बहुधा स्फुटमङ्कनानि क्षेमेण स व्यतपत क्षितिपालमौलिः ॥

सर्वं धैर्यविधूतमेरुविभवे सर्वंसहायां भरं
प्रौढेऽस्मिन्रघुनाथनाम्नि निदधत्पुत्रेऽच्युतक्ष्मापतिः ।
श्रीरङ्गस्थलसंगतो बुधकुलं शीतांशुरुर्वीमिव
प्राप्तः सैष पुपोष शेषशयने भक्तः परे धामनि ॥ ९४ ॥

प्रत्यर्थिव्रजभूरिदानपटुना बाहार्गलेनात्मनः
सर्वामम्बुधिभिश्चतुर्भिरनिशं सर्वंसहामावृताम् ।
रक्षन्नादरतो द्विबाहुरपरो लक्ष्मीशितेव प्रधी-
रायुष्मान्रघुनाथभूमिपरिणीरध्यास्त भद्रासनम् ॥ ९५ ॥

लोकालोकगताखिललोकालोकप्रियंकराकार ।
प्रमदवनीसुमकेलिप्रमदवशप्रेयसीमनोरसिक ॥ ९६ ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपु-
प्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।
कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो
जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥ ९७ ॥

प्रौढश्रीरघुनाथभूपतिकृपास्फारीभवत्साहिती-
साम्राज्यो निगमागमार्थनिपुणः श्रीयज्ञनारायणः ।
सर्गं द्वादशमञ्चितामृतदशं स व्यातनोदध्वरी
तत्राकद्वदविद्वदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ ९८ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-
चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्याप्तवाजपेययाजि-
गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-
याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ
साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये
द्वादशः सर्गः ।

त्रयोदशः सर्गः ।

चारो नत्रा चोदितः स प्रजानां दृष्ट्वा शत्रुक्ष्मापतीन्द्रप्रवृत्तीन् ।
वक्तुं वेगादागतो वासधाम्नः कक्ष्यामग्र्यामस्य कामप्यवाप ॥ १ ॥

नत्वाधीशं नन्तुमभ्येनमुर्व्यां नित्यं राज्ञां निर्यतामायतां च ।
सान्द्राः सेनाः सैन्धवेभप्रणादस्थेम्ना यस्यां सिन्धुबन्धुं हसन्ति ॥ २ ॥

क्ष्वेलाहेषाबृंहितैः क्ष्मापनानातूर्यध्वानो यत्र तूर्णं समेतः ।
स्वोपादानव्यापकत्वानुरूपं स्वच्छन्दः किं जृम्भते संभ्रमेण ॥ ३ ॥

स्फीतान्यब्धौ भूभृतो दानतोयान्येते नित्यं ह्रासयन्तीति मेघाः ।
पार्श्वे मत्ता यत्र पादेषु बद्धास्तान्येवेभाः संततं संत्यजन्ति ॥ ४ ॥

अग्रे यस्याः शश्वदन्योन्यदानामोदाघ्राणैर्हस्तिनां साग्रहाणाम् ।
फीट्कारैस्तद्बन्धने यत्नभाजां भीता घोषैश्चोद्भ्रमत्युष्ट्रपङ्क्तिः ॥ ५ ॥

स्वेन व्योम्नि स्थापितं किं स्थलत्वं नेति प्रायः क्ष्मां निरस्याश्वपङ्क्तिः ।
अभ्रे यस्यां धावते हन्त सद्यो रुद्धे पादोत्क्षिप्तरेणूत्करेण ॥ ६ ॥

धाराशिक्षाधाविनां सैन्धवानां क्षोणी पादैः क्षोभिता यत्र भूयः ।
वेत्राघातव्यस्तभूपालभूषापांसुव्रातैः प्राप्यते मांसलत्वम् ॥ ७ ॥

आपूर्यन्तः प्रौढलोहाग्नियन्त्रेष्वाविध्वानो यत्समीपे समीरः ।
सह्या स्वस्याः रातिसैन्यक्षिपायामुद्योगित्वं नित्यमुद्घुष्यतीव ॥ ८ ॥

हस्तग्राह्यापारलोहाग्नियन्त्रक्रूरैर्हालास्वादनाघूर्णिताक्षैः ।
संनद्धैर्या संततं पारसीकैरुत्साहैर्वा सप्रतीकैरुपेता ॥ ९ ॥

मित्रं नेतुस्तेजसो मित्रमश्वैर्धूल्या धाम्यामाहितं धूसराङ्गम् ।
पार्श्वे यस्याः पङ्क्तिरुर्वीरथानामुच्चैर्माष्टीविद्धूतैः केतुपट्टैः ॥ १० ॥

स्वस्वावासाक्रान्तिशौर्यापदानं चित्तन्यस्तं यत्न भूशीतभानोः ।
भित्तिष्वारादेक्ष्य भीतिं च लज्जां वेद्यां नम्रा बिभ्रते विद्विषन्तः ॥

आत्मीयाङ्घ्रिद्वन्द्वसेवाभिवृद्धश्रेयोराशेरस्य भूशीतभासः ।
रक्षां हृष्टः पूजया रामभद्रः कुर्वन्नास्ते यत्र कोदण्डपाणिः ॥ १२ ॥

शौर्योत्साहाश्चर्यसंकेतभूमिं कक्ष्यां दृष्ट्वा तादृशीं कौतुकेन ।
चारः संघे संमिलन्स प्रयत्नादन्यां कक्ष्यामान्तरोमाससाद ॥ १३ ॥
वेद्यां तस्या भूपतेर्वेत्रहस्तैर्द्वित्रैरेव स्थापितान्दत्तवृत्तीन् ।
कालस्येवालोकयत्कायभेदान्सोऽयं भीतो नित्यशुल्कांस्तुरुष्कान् ॥ १४ ॥
सद्योमृष्टस्वच्छताम्रोपमानैर्दीर्घश्मश्रुश्रेणिदीप्तैर्महद्भिः ।
शून्यालोकैरक्षतश्रोत्रयुग्मैर्वक्त्रैः क्रूरान्वक्रितभ्रूकुटीकैः ॥ १५ ॥
उद्भ्रान्ताक्षाल्लोहितोष्णीषबद्धांस्ताम्रच्छायैः सावतंसान्गरुद्भिः ।
वज्रप्रायैर्वर्मितान्वारबाणैर्निस्ताम्बूलान्मद्यनित्यावलिप्तान् ॥ १६ ॥
कट्यालम्बिप्रौढकौक्षेयसक्तं तूणीभारं बिभ्रतो दुर्विदग्धान् ।
सव्येनोच्चैः पाणिना शार्ङ्गचापं द्वित्रानन्येनापि तीक्ष्णान्पृषत्कान् ॥१७॥
सर्वत्राथ क्ष्मापसंघोपनीतैर्दीप्तां रत्नस्वर्णदीनाररूप्यैः ।
शश्वत्सोऽयं प्राप संख्यायमानैः कक्ष्यां संख्याजीविनां कांचिदन्याम् ॥
स्वस्वानीतस्वर्णदीनारसंख्याधीनान्संख्याजीविनो हन्त भूपाः ।
अज्ञातान्याराधनाः संश्रयन्तो दृष्ट्वान्योन्यं तत्र दीनास्त्रपन्ते ॥ १९ ॥
स्वस्वानीतस्वर्णसंख्येषु तस्यां संख्यावृत्तिष्वानतियीं नृपाणाम् ।
बाहाकूटैरुर्वराभारमुच्चैः शश्वद्वोढुं सैष संनाह एव ॥ २० ॥
त्रासं रत्नैस्तत्र शाणेषु घर्षैस्त्यक्त्वा भूपैस्तत्प्रदेशाच्चिरेण ।
तेजो नव्यं प्राप्यते दीपिताशं कामं राज्ञा तत्प्रतिग्राहिणा च ॥ २१ ॥
रेखा हैमीः काषपाषाणसक्ता लोलुप्यन्ते सिक्थकैर्यास्तदर्याः ।
स्वर्णप्रायं प्राभृतं स्वं दिशन्तः स्फूर्तिं धाम्नां मन्वते भूभृतस्ताः ॥ २२ ॥
अस्य क्षोणीनेतुरास्तेऽधिचित्तं गाम्भीर्यस्य स्वाधिका गाढतेति ।
द्रष्टुं पाथोराशिना तत्र केचिन्मुक्ता ज्ञात्वा मोचिता स्म्भ्रयन्ते ॥ २३ ॥
धार्यैर्नेतुर्हन्त तौल्येऽधिकारो रत्नैरेषां केति रोषात्तदर्याः ।
न्यस्तान्मानेष्वश्मनः किं तुलायां नह्यन्ति द्राक्प्राक्तनान्भस्त्रिकासु ॥२४॥
गोपैः स्वामिद्रव्यगुप्तिप्रशस्तैर्निध्यायासावास्थितां निर्निमेषैः ।
कक्ष्यां संख्याजीविनां कौतुकी तां द्वारं कामप्याप दौवारिकाढ्याम् ॥

आभाति स्वस्वाधिकारानुरूपैर्भूषाभाषावेषपोषैर्युतानाम् ।
सोष्णीषाणां कञ्चुकैः शोभितानां सेवाभाजां स्थानमारभ्य यस्याः ॥
वेत्राघातन्यस्तभूषा विशीर्णैं रत्नैर्नव्यैर्भक्तितो राजलोकाः ।
आतन्वन्तीवेश्वराङ्घ्रिं प्रणन्तुं भूयो यस्यां द्वारपूजां पुरस्तात् ॥ २७ ॥
आसाद्याहंपूर्विकामुर्वरेशैरागच्छद्भिः पूरिता या सदैव ।
प्रायो दातुं चारुतां पार्श्वसीम्नोर्लग्ना रत्नस्वर्णरम्याररम्याम् ॥ २८ ॥
द्वारस्तस्या भूपतेर्दर्शनार्थं वेषं योग्यं कल्पयन्वेत्रिवर्गैः ।
अन्तर्नीतः क्रोधरुद्धावनीभृत्संघैः सोऽयं भद्रशालां जगाहे ॥ २९ ॥
नानादेशस्थैर्नृपं नैकरूपैर्नन्तुं प्राप्तैर्या जनौघैर्विभाति ।
लोकेनेव प्रेरितः सेवनार्थं लोकालोकप्रावृतेनात्मसूनुः ॥ ३० ॥
नत्वा राज्ञो निर्यतो नाथमुर्व्या दृष्ट्वा रुद्धा द्वारि दौवारिकौघैः ।
राजानोऽन्ये तत्समा लज्जमाना यस्यां दैन्यं दृग्भिरेवोद्गिरन्ति ॥ ३१ ॥
कृत्ये नेतुर्धावतः क्वापि भृत्यान्द्वारादाज्ञाशक्तिदेहानिवेक्ष्य ।
तत्तद्देशाधीश्वरा यत्र भीत्या स्वस्वानीतिं शङ्कमानाः श्रयन्ते ॥ ३२ ॥
राजन्याली न्यस्तराजन्यचिह्ना भक्त्या यस्या भिद्यते प्राकृतेभ्यः ।
राज्ञे नीतैर्नैकरत्नोपहारैराकारैश्चाशेषभूषाञ्चितेभ्यः ॥ ३३ ॥
द्वारे रुद्धाः कोऽपि धात्रीवलारेर्वार्त्तां ज्ञातुं भूमिपास्तत्समीपात् ।
स्वस्वस्निग्धान्निर्यतो यत्र भृत्यान्सद्यो दत्वाभीप्सितं प्रश्नयन्ते ॥ ३४ ॥
दूरे नेतुः केऽप्यहो दुर्विदग्धाः स्थित्वा भृत्या भूमिपान्द्वारि कांश्चित् ।
मुग्धान्यस्या वारितान्मोहयन्ते मिथ्योदन्तैर्हर्तुमेभ्यो वसूनि ॥ ३५ ॥
साम्राज्यश्रीविश्वरूपैकशालां चारो दृष्ट्वा तामिमां भद्रशालाम् ।
द्रष्टुं भूयोऽप्यैच्छदाश्चर्यमक्ष्णोर्द्वन्द्वेनेव व्याहरन्विस्तृतेन ॥ ३६ ॥
क्वापि क्षोणीपालगोत्रेषु जातान्राज्ञो वेद्यां तत्र रम्याखिलाङ्गान् ।
यूनः सर्वानेकरूपानपश्यद्योधान्कांश्चित्सैष चारो निषण्णान् ॥ ३७ ॥
अङ्गैः स्फीतैर्नैकशस्त्रश्रमाणामत्युग्राणां शश्वदावर्तनेन ।
भूषाभेदैर्लक्षितानेणनाभीपुण्ड्रैश्चित्रैश्चन्दनस्थासकैश्च ॥ ३८ ॥

हस्ते कृत्यास्तीर्णिगुप्तेऽतिरौद्रं भूयोऽप्यूर्ध्वं शृण्वतः पक्षिनादम् ।
आबिभ्राणांश्चर्मवर्मावृताक्षाञ्श्यैनंपाताशीलिनः श्येनयूनः ॥ ३९ ॥

आज्ञालेखालेखकैरत्र कैश्चिन्नानाभूभृद्दूतनैकार्थनानाम् ।
पात्रैरन्यां वेदिमैक्षिष्ट धन्यां बाह्यैः प्राणैः प्राभवस्येव सोऽयम् ॥ ४० ॥

आचन्द्रार्कं भूभृतामन्वयेषु प्राज्यं लेख्यैः प्राभवं कल्पयद्भिः ।
धातारं तु व्यक्तिमात्रे धुनानैर्भूमोजानेरस्य भूम्ना महिम्नाम् ॥ ४१ ॥

राज्ञश्चूडानीलरत्नप्रभाभिः कृत्वा दीप्तां गृह्णतः पत्रलेखाम् ।
नैकद्वीपस्थाननाथत्वमुर्वीनेत्रे विज्ञाप्याशु नित्यं नयद्भिः ॥ ४२ ॥

मुक्तामुक्तैर्यन्त्रमुक्तैरमुक्तैर्मुक्तैः शस्त्रैः पूर्णमुक्तैश्चतुर्धा ।
कोशं प्रान्ते स स्पशः क्वापि योधैरैकाग्र्येण त्राणमैक्षिष्ट हृष्टः ॥ ४३ ॥

वेलावक्त्रा केनचिद्द्वारदेशादभ्येत्याथो भद्रशालान्तरस्थः ।
सोऽयं निन्ये विस्मयस्मेरचक्षुर्लक्षीभूतं मङ्क्षु लक्ष्मीविलासम् ॥ ४४ ॥

बिम्बं पश्यन्रत्नभित्तौ स्वमारादन्यं दानामोदमप्येतदीयम् ।
दृप्तो हस्ती दृश्यते यत्र बद्धो बाह्यस्थेमा भूपतेरौपवाह्यः ॥ ४५ ॥

कूटस्थानां दिग्जुषां कुञ्जराणां भूमिं पङ्क्त्या धारितां भूवलारैः ।
दोष्णा भर्तुर्धूर्वहोऽहं सदेति प्रायो दृप्तो यत्र भात्यौपवाह्यः ॥ ४६ ॥

मत्तो यत्रोदारमाणिक्यभित्तिद्योतस्रोतः पुष्कराग्रेण पीत्वा ।
सिञ्चन्नञ्चत्प्रीतिमास्ते करेणुं नागो रागोद्रेकवानौपवाह्यः ॥ ४७ ॥

तूर्यध्वानैर्गर्जितैर्धूपमभ्रं मत्वा नित्यस्थायि मायूरमुच्चैः ।
लास्यं केकागीतिरम्यं विधत्ते च्छेकैः कीरैः श्लाघ्यमानं यदीयैः ॥ ४८ ॥

राजीवानां यत्र रत्नाहितानामंशुस्रोतांस्यासवासारबुद्ध्या ।
स्वैरं पीत्वाप्यात्मतृष्णातिरेकात्तृप्तिर्नास्तीत्येव जानन्ति भृङ्गाः ॥ ४९ ॥

घासाङ्कूरानश्मगर्भस्थलांशून्भ्रान्त्वा लोलामेणपङ्क्तिं हसित्वा ।
यस्मिन्कीरा वासयष्टिभ्रमेण स्वर्णद्योतानापतन्तस्त्रपन्ते ॥ ५० ॥

बिम्बं यस्य स्वर्णभित्तिष्ववेक्ष्य प्राप्तुं सर्वत्रापि पाणिं प्रसार्य ।
एषा संसन्नेतुरेषेति राज्ञः शौकान्यग्रे संदिहानान्हसन्ति ॥ ५१ ॥

रुद्राध्यायान्नित्यरुद्रार्चनोक्तानुच्चैः कीराः पञ्जरेषूद्गृणन्तः ।
भूभृद्दानादानपात्राणि यस्मिन्भूमीदेवान्सर्व एवाक्षिपन्ति ॥ ९२ ॥

संक्रान्तात्मा यत्र सत्रा भवान्या रत्नस्तम्भेष्वेधते राजचूडः ।
भूयस्त्वेन प्रौढपूजाविधीनां कायव्यूहं कल्पयन्कौतुकीव ॥ ९३ ॥

भूत्वा भूमिं रक्षतो भूवलारेः साम्यं लब्धुं भूभृता शार्ङ्गपाणिः ।
लोकं रक्षन्मत्स्यरूपेण यस्मिन्नास्ते शेषेणानिशं चित्रितात्मा ॥ ९४ ॥

धृत्वा रक्षन्यत्र दोष्णा धरित्रीं स्थैर्यं लक्ष्म्याः स्थापयत्येष भूपः ।
इत्येवाहिं तल्पयन्निन्दिरायां सक्तः शार्ङ्गी चित्रितः साधु शेते ॥९५॥

राज्याङ्गश्रीवृद्धये राजतुल्यव्याहारैर्भूनिर्जरव्रातजप्यैः ।
जातेनोच्चैर्यः प्रतिध्वानभूम्ना हर्षेणैतान्सम्यगभ्यस्यतीव ॥ ९६ ॥

सौवर्णीभिर्भित्तिभिः शोभितो यो वज्रस्तम्भैर्वासवाश्मस्थलैश्च ।
किम्मीराभैर्नैकभेदप्रसूनस्रग्गन्धानां संगतानीव धत्ते ॥ ९७ ॥

रत्नैर्नानाजातिभिर्यन्निबद्धा रम्या भूपैर्यत्र सोपानपङ्क्तिः ।
आरोहद्भिः पर्वणामाशु भेदा गण्यन्ते तद्भिन्नकान्ति श्रितानाम् ॥ ९८ ॥

आस्ते नेतासाविहेति क्षितीन्द्रोरानम्यार्चा नूतना यत्र भूपाः ।
ऊरीकारव्यञ्जकोत्केरभावाद्विज्ञायार्चेत्यात्मना विस्मयन्ते ॥ ९९ ॥

रत्नोत्कीर्णे तत्र लक्ष्मीविलासे प्रीतोऽपश्यद्भद्रपीठे निषण्णम् ।
तेजोभिः स क्ष्मापतिं दीपिताशैः सान्द्रं शृङ्गे रत्नसानोरिवार्कम् ॥ ६० ॥

सद्यैरक्ष्णोरंशुभिः सान्द्रमर्कं रम्यं चन्द्रं राजता लक्ष्मणेन ।
वाक्यैर्युक्तं भोगिवर्यं सुधार्द्रैः प्रेक्ष्यैर्णाङ्गेनोज्ज्वलं पुष्पबाणम् ॥ ६१ ॥

गम्भीरत्वेऽप्याशयस्यार्यलोकैः कामं राशिं पाथसां प्राप्यमन्यम् ।
अन्यं मेरुं स्वात्मनो धीरतायामप्यंहःसु प्रत्यहं कातरं च ॥ ६२ ॥

पूर्णादब्धेरात्मदानाम्बुधारापूरेणाभ्रे वारि संगृह्य वृष्टे ।
भूमौ सर्वत्रापि भूपाः समेयद्दातारस्तद्दानकेल्यामतुल्यम् ॥ ६३ ॥

धृत्वा चित्ते साधु दृष्टिद्वयान्यां दैवीं सिन्धुं वाचि वक्रे कलां च ।
तौल्यं शंभोर्दर्शयन्तं स्वशक्तयाध्याबिभ्राणं पौरुषं पूर्णमेव ॥ ६४ ॥

आरक्ष्याशाः स्वालयारक्षमासामेकैकस्यास्तानधीशान्निजांशान् ।
आधत्तेऽसाविल्यमीषां गुणौघैः प्रीत्या भव्यैराश्रितं भिन्नभिन्नैः ॥ ६५ ॥

स्वैरं द्वीपानाहृतान्स्वैरनर्घ्यैन्रत्नस्तोमान्भित्तिरत्नैरसंख्यैः ।
प्रत्यस्तांशून्वीक्ष्य भग्नान्दयार्द्रैः पश्यन्तं दृग्विभ्रमैः पारसीकान् ॥ ६६ ॥

श्राव्यैर्दृश्यैः संभृतस्वापदानैः काव्यैः स्तोतॄन्सत्कवीन्काङ्क्षितानि ।
दत्त्वा भूयोऽप्यात्मदातृत्वभूम्ना प्रेम्णा दानात्प्रागिव प्रेक्षमाणम् ॥ ६७ ॥

श्लोकैर्नैकैः सत्कवीनां स्तुतानि श्रुत्वा संघैस्त्यागशौर्यार्जवानि ।
कुर्वाणं स्वं रत्नकोटीरमग्रे सद्यो हारश्रेणिसक्तानुबिम्बम् ॥ ६८ ॥

चारः स्वस्वाधीशचर्यां कथं वा वक्तेत्यन्तस्त्रासिनो वैकृतेन ।
उत्प्रेक्ष्यारात्तत्तदुर्वीपतीनां कार्याध्यक्षान्कानपि प्रेक्षमाणम् ॥ ६९ ॥

विज्ञाय नैकधरणीविभुचेष्टितानि वक्तुं समागतममुं वसुधासुधांशुः ।
आलोक्य चारमयमाह पुरो निषण्णं गोविन्दयज्वतिलकं गुणिनां प्रवेकम् ॥

प्रहितस्त्वया प्रणिधिरेष रयादवबुध्य तत्तदहिताचरणम् ।
पुनरागमन्मम पुरस्तदमुं परिपृच्छ वाचि पटुमच्छमतिम् ॥ ७१ ॥

वाचमिमाममुनावनिवलमथनस्यावतंस्य सचिवेन ।
दशनविभाभिर्जगदे दशदिशि दिवसेऽपि चन्द्रिकां सृजता ॥ ७२ ॥

अपिधाय पटाञ्चलाञ्चिताभ्यां स विनीतो वदनं चरः कराभ्याम् ।
अगदीद् द्विषतामथापदानान्यनुयुक्तो मखिनामधीश्वरेण ॥ ७३ ॥

स्वामिद्रोही जग्गराजः स्वमित्रैः कैश्चिद्भूपैः प्राप्य कर्णाटभूपम् ।
सेवाव्याजेनाशु सेनासनाथः सुप्तं रात्रौ सोऽवधीद्बन्धुपुत्रैः ॥ ७४ ॥

स मित्रसुतबान्धवैः सह निहत्य कर्णाटक-
प्रभुं स्वकुलपोषकं प्रबलपापदुर्व्यन्मतिः ।
ततोऽनु सहितो नृपैर्द्रमिडचेरपाण्ड्यादिभि-
र्भ्रमत्यनुचितक्रियापरवशोऽधिरङ्गस्थलम् ॥ ७५ ॥

हतेऽथ कर्णाटनृपे सहात्मजैस्ततोऽवशिष्टं पृथुकं तदात्मजम् ।
कमप्युपायादपहृत्य यत्नतः कथंचिदायाति स याचभूपतिः ॥ ७६ ॥

आलम्ब्य मङ्क्षु धरणीन्द्र महानुभावमागन्तुकैकशरणं प्रबलं बलेन ।
याचक्ष्मापतिरसाविह याचति त्वां सख्यं जितो रिपुनृपैः स्वविमुत्वहेतुम् ॥

कर्णाटप्रभुसूनुमात्मविमतं कंचिद्गृहीत्वा शिशुं
त्वामभ्यागमदेष याचमहिपस्तूर्णं भियेत्यन्वहम् ।
पाण्ड्यश्चेरसखोऽथ जग्गविभुना पापेन च प्रेरितः
कावेरीतटधर्मसेतुमचलं कैश्चित्क्रुधाभेदयत् ॥ ७८ ॥

इत्याख्यातं प्रणिधेरेष वाक्यं सत्यालापः प्रतिघेनावकर्ण्य ।
स्तुत्यप्रज्ञो रघुनाथावनीन्द्रः प्रत्यज्ञास्त प्रबलस्तत्क्षणेन ॥ ७९ ॥

गत्वा संप्रति कुम्भघोणमुचितं कर्णाटनेतुः सुतं
बालं तं शरणागतं विरचये पट्टाभिषिक्तं बलात् ।
प्रौढश्रीरधिभद्रपीठि निवसन्पाथोधिभिः प्रावृतां
सर्वामप्यवनिं स राममहिपः स्वैरं चिरं रक्षतु ॥ ८० ॥

अन्तरीपगतमम्बुधेरहं चोलकं सपदि चोदितैर्नृपैः ।
कैश्चिदेव युधि खण्डये पुरा बन्धुपुत्रसहितं प्रतापतः ॥ ८१ ॥

पाण्ड्यं तुण्डीरचेरद्रमिडमगधभूपालमुख्यैः सपत्नै-
र्हस्तग्राहं गृहीत्वा सपदि समिति तत्तत्समस्तार्थजातम् ।
योधैराहार्य शूरैः पटगृहमखिलं योजयित्वा च वह्नि-
ज्वालाभिर्भासयेऽहं दिशि दिशि सततं जैत्रवृत्तिर्महांसि ॥ ८२ ॥

छिन्नैर्जग्गनृपादिबाहुजनुषां सेतुं शिरःकर्परैः
कावेर्यां युधि बन्धयामि सुदृढं कामं तथाहं भटैः ।
स्पष्टं तैर्विधृताभिरेव लिपिभिः स्वायंभुवोभिर्यथा
कर्तव्यं जयरेखिकाविरचनं कल्प्येत कल्पावधि ॥ ८३ ॥

इतीरयन्वचनमिलावलाहितो धराधुरां निजसचिवे निवेश्य च ।
स रोहितात्सदसि सरोषमीक्षणादनीकिनीमथ प्रमनोनहत्क्षणात् ॥ ८४ ॥

अखण्डकाण्डीरमनन्तकौन्तिकं प्रगल्भयाष्टीकमनल्पधन्विकम् ।
प्रमत्तशाक्तीकमभूद्बलं प्रभोरपारपारश्वधिकं भयानकम् ॥ ८५ ॥

स्कन्धेषु विस्तृतकुथेषु करिव्रजानामध्यास्य साधु घटितानथ लोहमञ्चान् ।
संचारिनीलगिरिदुर्गगता इवारादाधोरणा विबभुरङ्कुशगर्भहस्ताः ॥ ८६ ॥

शिरस्त्रिणः कनकसिरालकञ्चुकाश्चकाशिरे पथि पथि शार्ङ्गपाणयः ।
तुरंगमान्स्यदचतुरं गमागमेष्वधिष्ठिता युधि विदितान्निषादिनः ॥ ८७ ॥

क्रमेण केचन विदधुः क्रमेलकेष्ववस्थितं द्रुतमुरु मञ्चमास्थिताः ।
स्ववस्तुभिः पथिकजनोचितैः समं जयानकं विमतभयानकं भटाः ॥

व्यजृम्भत ससंभ्रमं युगविवर्तनृत्तत्वरा-
पुराहितकरस्फुरड्डमरुडंक्रियाडम्बरम् ।
समं विमतभैरवैः समरशंसि शङ्खारवैः
प्रयाणपटहध्वनिः प्रसभमध्वराशाध्वनि ॥ ८९ ॥

कुलस्थितिभृतां कुलं सकलमाकुलं व्यातनो-
त्समुच्चलितसिन्धुभिः पटुरवैस्तदा दुन्दुभिः ।
निजाधिपभुजाधिकप्रसृतविक्रमन्यक्कृत-
द्विषत्परिषदास्पदार्पणसमुन्मिषद्रोषतः ॥ ९० ॥

भाङ्कारेण घनेन जातविवरं ब्रह्माण्डभाण्डोदरं
भेरी मङ्क्षु बिभेद कोणनिहता युद्धोद्भटैस्तद्भटैः ।
सौवक्ष्मामतिधैर्यशौर्यविनयौदार्यस्वभावार्जिता
कीर्तिर्व्याप्तजगत्त्रया किममुना रुद्धेति कोपोद्धता ॥ ९१ ॥

द्वीपं स्फूर्जथुनर्मबन्धुभिरधाद्वाक्सिन्धुभिर्दुन्दुभिः
संभ्रान्तं विजयप्रयाणसमये संभावितैर्भाङ्कृतैः ।
प्रागेव स्वविभोः प्रतापविभवाद्बाधां विधास्येतरां
शत्रूणामहमेव तत्र वसतामित्युद्धतः कोपतः ॥ ९२ ॥

कल्पान्तानल्पजल्पत्तरमुदिरसुहृज्जैत्रपात्राभिधायी
भेरीध्वानस्तदानीं बलिनिलयबिलाध्वानमद्धा निरोद्धा ।
बाधिर्यापादधुर्योऽप्यखिलतनुभृतां कर्णरन्ध्रानुबन्धी
चक्षुःश्रोत्राधिनेत्रा भयमुकुलदृशा चक्षमे तत्क्षणेन ॥ ९३ ॥

पाथोनिधिं बलरजोभरलुप्तमर्कं शस्त्राभिघातहतशत्रुविदारितं च ।
आवासमाद्यमुपकल्प्य तथापि शौरेरावासयन्हृदयमोदितसाधुलोकैः ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपु-
प्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।
कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो
जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥ ९५ ॥

प्रौढश्रीरघुनाथभूपतिकृपास्फारीभवत्साहिती-
साम्राज्यो निगमागमार्थनिपुणः श्रीयज्ञनारायणः ।
काव्येऽपूरयत त्रयोदशममुं सर्गं मखिग्रामणी-
रत्नाकद्रुद विद्वदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ ९६ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-
चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्याप्तवाजपेययाजि-
गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-
याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ
साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये
त्रयोदशः सर्गः ।

चतुर्दशः सर्गः ।

प्रत्यर्थिप्रभुविजयप्रयाणयोग्यं संनद्धे महति बले स भूषणानि ।
आभृत्य प्रकृतिमनोहरैरथाङ्गैराकाङ्क्षीन्महिपरिणीरनुग्रहीतुम् ॥ १ ॥

काश्मीरद्रवमृगनाभिगन्धसारप्रालेयप्रभृति विलेपनं भरन्त्यः ।
आदर्शं कनकमयाम्बरं स्रजं च क्ष्मापाकाहितमभजन्क्षणेन कान्ताः ॥ २ ॥

स्थालेषु द्रुतकनकोज्ज्वलेषु जालं प्रक्षिप्य क्षितिपमणेः परिष्क्रियाणाम् ।
कोटीराङ्गदवलयादि कोमलाङ्ग्यः प्रह्वन्ना द्रुतमपराश्च पर्यवृण्वन् ॥ ३ ॥

स्थाले काचन मणिभूषणं दधाना द्रष्टुं भूपतिमपटुस्त्रपावशेन ।
आनम्राननममुमीक्षते स्म सम्यग्भूषाञ्चन्नवमणिपोषितानुबिम्बम् ॥ ४ ॥

कान्तानां शशिविशदेष्वसौ कपोलेष्वाकारं निजमवलोकयन्नथापि ।
आदर्शं क्षितिरतिजानिरन्वगृह्णादालोकैर्धृत इति किं प्रियाजनेन ॥ ५ ॥

वक्षोजस्थलविधृते वसुंधरेन्द्रं कस्याश्चित्प्रतिफलितं घनात्मदर्शे ।
आद्राक्षीदधिगतवक्षसं विदित्वा सासूयं प्रियमबलाजनस्तदन्यः ॥ ६ ॥

अस्य क्ष्माकमितुरनस्तिसाम्यमङ्गं सैषाग्रे मुकुरगतं स्वयं विधाय ।
आधत्ते कथमयितोपमानमद्येत्यन्यास्तां मुकुरकरामहो निनिन्दुः ॥ ७ ॥

आदर्शे प्रतिफलितं हृतामृतांशुप्रासन्यं वदनममुष्य भासते स्म ।
बाह्यं तद्रुचिविभवं बलेन हृत्वा कोपेन द्रुतमिव गाहमानमन्तः ॥ ८ ॥

चूडायां ग्रथितममुष्य सूनमाल्यं शोभामाधित वसुधासुधाकरस्य ।
देवस्य स्मितजितविद्विषत्पुरस्य त्रिस्रोतःसरिदिव शेखरीभवन्ति ॥ ९ ॥

स्वच्छन्दोज्ज्वलकवितासुधैकभूषाभव्यस्यानिशमवनीपतेर्मुखस्य ।
संघातं यश इव वज्रसंघदीप्रं कोटीरं शिरसि धृतं किमप्यराजीत् ॥ १० ॥

पद्मारिं क्षयभरितं नभोगमिन्दुं संत्यज्याखिलगुणसान्द्रमुर्वरेन्दुम् ।
ताराणाममुमुचितुं समाश्रितानां मोहं व्यातनिषत मौलिमौक्तिकानि ॥ ११ ॥

नासायै कनकसुमाय नर्महेतोः कैश्येन भ्रमरगणेन चोदितस्य ।
दूतस्य व्यरचयत द्युतिं धरित्रीशीतांशोर्मृगमदचित्रकं ललाटे ॥ १२ ॥

भूषा यद्गजनभुवो भुवो वलारेरङ्गानां मणिखचिताः किलाखिलानाम् ।
सैव श्रीः श्रयति सदावयोरपाङ्गौ दृष्टेति त्यजत इव स्म चक्षुषी ताः ॥

राजेन्दोः श्रुतिधृतरत्नकर्णिकाभ्यां कान्तादप्ययति न किं कपोलयुग्मात् ।
चारुत्वं सततमनन्यसाधितं मामित्युच्चैः स्मयभरितेव नासिकाभात् ॥१४॥

श्रोत्रे सुश्रुतबहुलश्रुतैकभूषे तस्यालंकृतिरुचिरे तथाप्यभूताम् ।
कर्तुं स्वान्तिकगतगल्लुकाभिरूप्यं कोऽप्येवं जयति गुणो बहुश्रुतानाम् ॥

मुक्तानां मुखविधुमुग्धचन्द्रिकाभिः शोभाभिः स्म वहति कर्णिके स्फुरन्त्यौ ।
भूपालः पुरविजयीव नाव्यरिङ्खत्स्वर्गङ्गास्रुतियुगलौ कपोलसक्ताम् ॥

सर्वाण्यप्यवनिपतिं समेत्य भूषावृत्तीनि प्रकटमयन्ति विश्रुतत्वम् ।
रत्नानीत्यधरतया रदश्रियेव स्थित्वा विश्रुतमहसत्स्वयं प्रवालम् ॥ १७ ॥

काश्मीरद्रवकलिताङ्गराग एष क्ष्मापालो धृतमृदुकञ्चुको व्यलासीत् ।
ईशानश्वशुर इवात्तरक्तधातुः प्रालेयैरवनिधरः परीतमूर्तिः ॥ १८ ॥

गाङ्गेयाकलितमयं कटिप्रदेशे वासः स क्षितितिलवासवो वसानः ।
स्वर्णाद्रिः सविधचरस्य चित्रभानोः संवीतः किरणचयैरिव व्यराजीत् ॥

वक्षान्तःश्रितयुवतिव्रजानुबिम्बं बिभ्राणः पतकमसौ विशामधीशः ।
साधर्म्यं वहति पुरा सरोजनाभेर्वक्षोभूधृतवनजालयाशतस्य ॥ २० ॥

चाञ्चल्यं गुणमजहात्स्वमात्मकन्या वक्षोभूतलवल्लजेतुराश्रितेति ।
मुक्तास्तज्जलनिधिना मुदा नियुक्ता हारत्वं दधुरनिशं दिदृक्षमाणाः ॥ २१ ॥

मन्थक्ष्माधरमथनार्भटीसमुद्यत्क्षीराम्भोनिधिपरिकीर्णबिन्दुभाजः ।
दैत्यारेरवनितलक्षपाकरोऽसौ हाराणां निकरमसस्मरद्दधानः ॥ २२ ॥

माणिक्यप्रकरमहःप्रदीपिताशं केयूरं क्षितिनवमीनकेतुराधात् ।
प्रत्यर्थिक्षितिपजयप्रसङ्गहर्षाद्बाहाया बहिरिव निःसृतं प्रतापम् ॥ २३ ॥

क्ष्मापालो मणिघटितस्य कङ्कणस्य व्याजेन स्वकमणिबन्धकल्पितस्य ।
कर्तव्यं प्रतिसरबन्धकर्म पूर्वं व्यातानीद्द्विजयरमाविवाहहेतोः ॥ २४ ॥

श्रीरामाक्षरजपशीलनाय पाणिव्यासक्ता व्यतपत मौक्तिकाक्षमाला ।
संदर्भक्रम इव संश्रितः शरण्यं क्षोणीन्द्रं कुकविकुलेन बाध्यमानः ॥ २५ ॥

पादस्थं मणिकटकं प्रभोः प्रजानामौपम्यं परमुचितं तदा भजेत ।
उत्क्षिप्ते बलिमदहन्तुरूर्ध्वमङ्घ्रौ लग्नं चेन्नखकृतरन्ध्रमर्कबिम्बम् ॥ २६ ॥
भूषाभिर्व्यतपत भूषितो नृपालः संक्रान्तप्रतिफलनस्तदात्मदर्शे ।
सस्नेहं बहिरुपलिप्तभूतिशुद्धे चण्डीशो मनसि यथा तपोधनानाम् ॥ २७ ॥
आदर्शे प्रतिकृतिमास्थितस्तदानीमौपम्यं समुचितमुर्वरावलारिः ।
स्फूर्जन्त्या महति सुदर्शनस्य मध्ये कंसारेरभजदसौ कयापि मूर्त्या ॥
प्रेयस्यः प्रमदमधुः प्रियेण दृष्टाः पौरस्त्याः प्रतिघमवस्थितास्तु पश्चात् ।
आदर्शप्रतिफलनात्तदाशयज्ञो व्याहारैरथ मुदिताः स ता व्यतानीत् ॥
भूषाभिः सपदि विभूषितप्रतीकः शुद्धान्ते निजसुमुखीजनान्प्रवेश्य ।
प्राणंसीदथ विजयप्रयाणकाङ्क्षी वैदेहीपतिमवनीवलप्रमाथी ॥ ३० ॥
साष्टाङ्गं स्वकुलधनं प्रणम्य सम्यग्व्याहारैर्विजितसुधाझरीविहारैः ।
कोटीराञ्चलघटिताञ्जली रघूणामस्तोष्ट प्रभुमिति भूपतिः प्रहृष्टः ॥ ३१ ॥
क्ष्मानम्रंकरणमुनीन्द्रसोदरेषो पश्याङ्घ्रिश्वशुरपदाब्जरेणुलेश ।
स्वोपायार्जितधरणीसुरत्वमौनिप्रक्रान्ताध्वरपरिरक्षणप्रवीण ॥ ३२ ॥
तुभ्यं दृक्प्रहरणदुर्धराशुगासस्थैमैकावधिबल देवसार्वभौम ।
भूयांसो रघुकुलभूषण प्रणामा भूयासुर्द्रुहिणपुरंदरादिवन्द्य ॥ ३३ ॥
द्वीपस्थं रघुतिलक द्विषं मथित्वा तस्याहं पुरि कलये तव प्रतिष्ठाम् ।
साहाय्यं युधि मम संविधेहि तत्रेत्यभ्यर्थ्य क्षितिभृदतः प्रतिष्ठते स्म ॥
सम्राजामथ रघुनाथसार्वभौमः संवेन द्विषमभिषेणयन्पुरायम् ।
आस्थानीभुवि समसैन्यतोपचारान्स्वस्वार्हान्विरचयता सहादरेण ॥ ३५ ॥
भूपालैरुपरि भृतैः स खेटकौघैः सौवर्णैरवनिशतक्रतुः परीतः ।
अस्मत्तो भुवमयितो मधुप्रमाथीत्यर्कैर्द्वादशभिरिवाश्रितो व्यलासीत् ॥
गाङ्गेयं कटिभुवि कल्पयन्करङ्गं बाहायां वदनमृजापटीं च तस्य ।
कश्चिद्भूभृदथ करप्रसारवेलां विज्ञाय स्म दिशति वीटिकादलानि ॥ ३७ ॥
पादाग्रे व्यतपत वज्रपादुकायाः क्ष्माभर्तुर्द्युतिरपरेण कल्पितायाः ।
अश्रान्त्याः पदकमलासवत्वमुद्रां गङ्गायाः स्तुतिरिव कंसहिंसकस्य ॥

अन्याभ्यां विभुमभितः प्रकीर्णके द्वे व्याधूते विमलतरे व्यरोचिषाताम् ।
बाहुभ्यामिव यशसी प्रतापवद्भ्यां संजाते त्रिभुवनचङ्क्रमाय लोले ॥३९॥
क्ष्मापालस्तदनु करं स पञ्चशाखे नेपालक्षितिपरिणेतुराद्धानः ।
उद्वेलान्निपतितमुद्धरन्नलक्ष्मीपर्यायादिव तटिनीपतेरराजीत् ॥ ४० ॥
आभूमिप्रसृमरकञ्चुकाग्रधारिस्वाभ्याशापतदवनम्रसार्वभौमः ।
भूपोऽग्रे चलितपुरोहितद्वयीकः कक्ष्याः काञ्चन समलङ्घत क्रमेण ॥४१॥
पृच्छन्तः प्रतिपुरुषं पृथक्पृथक्क्ष्मापाकारैरवसरमुर्वरापरिण्यः ।
व्याहारं मगधगणस्य बाह्यकक्ष्यावेदीषु श्रुतिविषयं व्यधुर्निषण्णाः ॥
शुद्धान्तादयमवनीसुधांशुराराद्यातीत्यथ मगधोक्तिभिर्विदन्तः ।
बाह्यालीभुवमवरुह्य वेदिकाभ्यः संमर्दक्षममवतस्थिरे नरेन्द्राः ॥ ४३ ॥
अन्योन्यव्यतिहतिशीर्णभूपभूषाधूलीभिर्द्विरदमदैश्च पङ्किलायाम् ।
बाह्यालीभुवि पतिताः स्म हारमुक्ता भासन्ते किल यशसां नवप्ररोहाः ॥
प्रस्थानं विदधति पार्थिवे तदानीं कुर्वाणा स्वपरिजनान्कुहापि भीत्या ।
आदाय द्रुततरमायुधानि तेभ्यः सम्राजामबिभृत संसदं ससीम्नि ॥ ४५ ॥
आक्रान्तेष्वलमथ वेत्रिभिः प्रहारं तन्वानैरपकरणं तदा नृपेषु ।
बाह्यालीभुवमभिता श्रिता पाताकिन्यातानीद्द्रुतमधिकं गतागतानि ॥
गन्धेभागमतरलक्रमेलकौघक्रोङ्कारैरुपरि पतत्सु घोटकेषु ।
श्लिष्यन्त्यो भयचलिताश्चिरेण योधान्संतुष्टान्व्यदधत वारसारसाक्ष्यः ॥
आयाति क्षितिभृदयं विवर्तनीयो गन्धेभो मदकरटी निवर्त्यतां द्राक् ।
पन्थानं स तु निरुणद्धि पत्तिराराद्भ्येतीत्यजनि तदा निषादिघोषः ॥
संनद्धा भवत समुल्लसन्नभीक्ष्णं घोटीनां निकटमुपैति घोटझाटः ।
पादातं भुवि पतितं भवेत्तदेनं गृह्णीतेत्यभिदधिरे गिरं हयस्थाः ॥४९॥
संमर्दादभिपततः क्षमाक्षिपन्तो दीपाभे यवनभटा दृशौ दधानाः ।
अश्नन्तः प्रतिमुहुरादधुः कलङ्कं दुर्वृत्ताः करकरवालधूननानि ॥ ५० ॥
बिभ्राणैर्वरिवसितः स भृत्यमुद्रां भूपालैरथ रघुनाथभूबिडौजाः ।
बाह्यालीभुवमकरोत्पदारविन्दद्वन्द्वेनोपरिकलितेन धन्यधन्याम् ॥५१॥

भेरीणां मदकरिणां भटोत्तमानामश्वानामपि समभावि भाङ्क्रियाभिः ।
फोट्कारैर्निजबिरुदोक्तिभिस्तदानीं हेषाभिश्च युगपदेकतां प्रपन्नैः ॥५२॥

क्ष्माजानेः स्तुतिपठितानि मागधानां भेरीभाङ्कृतिबधिरीकृतश्रवोभिः ।
भूपालैरनुमिमिरे भुजप्रसारासाराभ्यामधरदलैश्चलाचलैश्च ॥ ५३ ॥

तत्तद्भूपतिजनुषस्तदा जनानामासन्नान्विनयजुषोऽथ नायकाय ।
नामानि त्वरितमुदीर्य नैककानि व्यक्तानारचयत वेत्रिणां समूहः ॥५४॥

विज्ञप्तो विभुरवनेः स वेत्रिलोकैरालोकैस्तदनु कृतार्थतामनैषीत् ।
गाङ्गेयत्सरुकरवालगर्भमारात्कुर्वाणं नृपकुलमञ्जलिं किरीटे ॥ ५५ ॥

व्याहारैः कतिचन मन्दहासतोऽन्या-
न्व्यापारैरपि नयनाञ्चलस्य कांश्चित् ।
सम्राजां स तु समभावयद्यथार्हं
संदोहानथ रघुनाथसार्वभौमः ॥ ५६ ॥

आद्यन्ताञ्चलनवरत्नपट्टयुग्मव्यानद्धोच्चितनतमध्यवेणुदण्डाम् ।
वोढारः कनकमयीं वसुंधरायाः शीतांशोर्नवशिबिकामकार्षुरग्रे ॥ ५७ ॥

पर्याणं कनकमृगाधिपालरूपं बिभ्राणं नरपतिविक्रमानुरूपम् ।
सादी तन्निकटभुवं शनैरनैषीदाश्चर्यावहनिजचर्यमश्ववर्यम् ॥ ५८ ॥

कोऽप्युद्यत्करटकटाहदानतोयैः प्रस्विन्नं गिरिमिव निर्झरप्रवाहैः ।
अभ्यर्णं तदनु कमप्यनेकपानामानैष्ट प्रवरममुष्य भूमिजानेः ॥ ५९ ॥

भ्रूसंज्ञां द्रुतमवधाय भूसुधांशोराहत्य प्रतिमुहुरङ्कुशेन यन्ता ।
आभुग्नाग्रिमचरणाग्रमल्पनम्रग्रीवाङ्कं गजमधिताधिरोहयोग्यम् ॥ ६० ॥

मातङ्गं विनतमसौ महीपतीनामध्यक्षः शिखरिसदृक्षमध्यरुक्षत् ।
आरूढावनुमपरौ च भूमिपालौ पश्चाद्धौ करधृतवीटिकाप्रकीर्णौ ॥ ६१ ॥

विज्ञायाशयमवलोकनेन राज्ञो विज्ञास्ते विनयभृतो विशामधीशाः ।
आरूढा निजनिजमौपवाह्यमेनं पर्यन्तक्षितिमधिगम्य पर्यवृण्वन् ॥ ६२ ॥

आहन्यादयमहितान्नृपानमीषु प्राप्ताः किं स्वकुलभवा न वेत्यवैतुम् ।
आयातं शशिनमिवावनीवलारेरग्रे कोऽप्यबिभृत शुभ्रमातपत्रम् ॥ ६३ ॥

बिभ्राणाः कुलबिरुदीभवन्ति राज्ञः केऽप्यग्रे मकरमयानि केतनानि ।
सौन्दर्यादपरिमिताङ्गभूसमष्टिं तं व्यक्तं किमु समसूचयञ्जनाय ॥ ६४ ॥

उत्क्षिप्ते स्फुटमुदितानुबिम्बदम्भात्सौवर्णे धरणिशचीपतेर्धवित्रे ।
विद्वेष्यैः प्रतिमुहुरात्मबिम्बभेदाद्भीतो भूतलमभजत्प्रियो नलिन्याः ॥६५॥

दिवाप्रदीपैर्नरदेवमेनं निषेवितारो निकषा व्यराजन् ।
त्वज्जैत्रयात्रासमयेऽभियातीनोद्दक्प्रतापा इति सूचयन्तः ॥ ६६ ॥

स्कन्धावबद्धगुणसक्तपदाहतेन दन्ताञ्चलाञ्चितधरातलमानमय्य ।
गन्धद्विपान्युगपदङ्कुशगर्भमेनमाधोरणा विरचिताञ्जलयः प्रणेमुः ॥ ६७ ॥

आधूतखड्गतिलका मुहुरानतानि कृत्वा शिरांसि परिक्लृप्तगभीरघोषम् ।
दूरादकुर्वत तुरुष्कभटा धरित्रीपाकद्विषः सविनयं प्रणतिं हयस्थाः ॥

राज्ञामादधदथ तस्य नेतुराज्ञामुत्तंसस्रजमिव तूर्णमुत्तमाङ्गे ।
कल्पान्तप्रसृमरसिन्धुबन्धुकल्पां सेनानीश्चतुरमनीकिनीमतानीत् ॥ ६९ ॥

सैन्यैस्तस्य जनेश्वरस्य चलितैः शौर्यन्महीमण्डलं
संभ्रान्ते सकले कुलाचलकुले संत्रस्यतामारवान् ।
सिंहानामवकर्ण्य सिन्धुरगणे दिश्ये द्रुते भ्रश्यता
भूभारेण निमग्नमस्तकमणिर्भुग्नः फणीशोऽभवत् ॥ ७० ॥

संघीभूतमनुक्रमेण सदनद्वारावकाशोचितं
बाह्यालीस्थलतो वलत्क्षितिवलंप्रद्वेषिणस्तद्बलम् ।
साधर्म्यं बिभरांबभूव सरितामीशस्य कल्पक्षया-
नल्पक्षोभविभिन्नसेतुसरणीनिःसारिणा वारिणा ॥ ७१ ॥

विदधति रघुनाथक्षोणिवृत्राभियातौ
विमतविजययात्रां वीरलोकाग्रगण्ये ।
अनुगृहमदसीयालोकलोलाशयानां
कुवलयनयनानां कोऽपि कोलाहलोऽभूत् ॥ ७२ ॥

धरापाकारातिं तदनु तनुमध्याः कलयितुं
वितन्वत्यः सौधान्विघटितगवाक्षाररपुटान् ।
जनानां व्याचक्रुर्जनितकुतुकान्वीक्षितुममुं
समुन्मीलन्नेत्रान्विमतजययात्रां विदधतम् ॥ ७३ ॥

अक्षुद्रनैकविधकाव्यरसावसीद दिक्षुद्रवामृतझरीघनमाधुरीक ।
संतानविस्मयविधायकनित्यदानसंतानपोषितसमस्तबुधप्रवेक ॥ ७४ ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपु-
प्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।
कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो
जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥ ७५ ॥

श्रीगोविन्दमखीन्दुवंशमणिना श्रीयज्ञनारायणा-
भिख्येनाध्वरिणा कृते मधुसुधारोधाय मेधाविना ।
काव्येऽपूरि मितश्चतुर्दशतया सर्गो निसर्गोज्ज्वल-
स्तत्राकद्रुदविद्रुदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ ७६ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-
चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्याप्तवाजपेययाजि-
गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-
याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ
साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये
चतुर्दशः सर्गः ।

पञ्चदशः सर्गः ।

प्रचलिता तदनु प्रति वीथिकां पटुरटत्पटहोदितचङ्क्रमा ।
प्रवहदम्बुनिधिप्रभवश्रियं समवनोदवनीभृदनीकिनी ॥ १ ॥

स्थलरथाः किल यत्र समुन्नताः प्रतिपदं रचिताः प्रचकाशिरे ।
नगरदेवतया न कथं धृता बहुविधं फलिताः स्वमनोरथाः ॥ २ ॥

स्थलरथाः स्वकुटुङ्कतटोल्लगन्मुकुरपङ्क्तिनिभेन मुहुर्मुहुः ।
अनिमिषेण किमक्षिशतेन यान्निरवधिप्रमदं निरवर्णयन् ॥ ३ ॥

जयकृते चरतोऽस्य धरापतेः समुचितं किल यत्र धरा प्रिया ।
विरचिता रुरुचे विरजस्तया प्रतिमुहुर्मिहिकाभरसेकतः ॥ ४ ॥

विशिखया विरजीकृतया जनैः पुनरभूयत भूरिपरागया ।
मम सुमैरिति यां मधुधारया प्रसवतोरणपङ्क्तिरसिञ्चत ॥ ५ ॥

प्रसवतोरणदामभृतासवप्रसनकर्मगतव्यसनानलीन् ।
कनकसौधघटा किनु विद्रुतान्व्यधित यत्र चलध्वजपाणिभिः ॥ ६ ॥

इभगणैरभिषङ्गमिदं भजेत्कुवलतोरणमित्यकुतोहतम् ।
यदभितः स्थितसौधगताः स्त्रियः स्वनयनांशुभिरेव तदा दधुः ॥ ७ ॥

कदलिका गणिकाजनमन्दिरप्रघणसीम्नि गताः प्रचकाशिरे ।
क्षितिभुजे किमु यत्र समेष्यते भणितुमूरुभिरात्मविभाहृतिम् ॥ ८ ॥

उभयपार्श्वगृहोपरिजालकश्रितवधूवदनाम्बुजदम्भतः ।
मुखसहस्रनधारि मुदैव यां नगरदेवतया न किमीक्षितुम् ॥ ९ ॥

अधियदीयशिरोगृहमञ्जलिप्रचुरलाजभृतो गणिकाजनाः ।
विजयलक्ष्मिविवाहकृते विभोर्हविरिवोचितमादधतो बभुः ॥ १० ॥

रतिपतौ रघुनाथजनाधिपं श्रयितुमात्मपरार्धसमद्युतिम् ।
यदभितःस्थितयौवतसैनिकैः सममधिज्यधनुः समनह्यत ॥ ११ ॥

कनकभाजनकल्पितदीपिकाश्रितकरः किल यद्गणिकाजनः ।
स्वमतनुज्वलनाकुलमीक्षयन्निजनिजावसथप्रघणेऽवसत् ॥ १२ ॥

परिगताः प्रतिभूमि जना घना विभुगृहेष्वभितो ऽयतपन्त याम् ।
किमवकाशकृते प्रचलिष्यतो नृपबलस्य पुरे निचिताः क्वचित् ॥ १३ ॥

घनिकगेहगवाक्षतटागतानगरुधूपभरानपदिश्य या ।
क्षणदयेव कयापि समाश्रिता जनपतेर्घटनाय जयश्रिया ॥ १४ ॥

तदनु सौधतटेषु शिरोगृहेष्वधिनिकेतकुटुङ्कमपि स्थिताः ।
क्षितिपदर्शनकौतुकशंसिनः कृतपरिप्लवनैर्नयनैर्जनाः ॥ १५ ॥

उपचितं शनकैरुरुघोषणं श्रवणरन्ध्रमरुन्द्ध समन्ततः ।
अरिभयानकमानकसंभवं भवनहर्म्यजुषां हरिणीदृशाम् ॥ ॥ १६ ॥

पटहनिस्वनतो बधिरीकृतश्रवणरन्ध्रतया शफरीदृशः ।
अथ परस्परमङ्गुलिसंज्ञया विविधया स्वगतं व्यवजह्रिरे ॥ १७ ॥

अभवदौष्ट्रकहास्तिकसंसजद्विजयदुन्दुभिघोषविभीषणैः ।
कतिपयैरवनीकमितुश्चमूमुखचरैर्नगरी मुखरीकृता ॥ १८ ॥

जयमहास्तिकहास्तिकसत्समित्प्रकटनोद्भटहृद्भटताडिताः ।
अजनयन्प्रभुदुन्दुभयो रणं प्रतिमहोन्दुभयोदयकारणम् ॥ १९ ॥

घनतरौषधशृङ्गकनत्कटीघटितकच्छपुटच्छुरितासिभिः ।
अनलवर्तियुतैर्नलिकायुधैः कतिपयैर्वसुधाथ करम्बिता ॥ २० ॥

पटहभाङ्कृतिभिर्बधिरीकृतश्रवणरन्ध्रजुषः सुदृशोऽभवन् ।
प्रतिभयाकृतिभिर्नलकायुधैः प्रतिमुहुश्च निमीलितलोचनाः ॥ २१ ॥

दृढतरांसधृतेषुधिपार्श्वभूकलितबर्हिकलापकलापिनः ।
अटनिदेशगतामलचामरस्तबकसज्जशरासनयष्टयः ॥ २२ ॥

अनुचराहितवीजनचामरद्वितयमध्यधृतोत्प्लवनैः परैः ।
युगपदीक्षितयोधनपाटवाः पुनरमंदुरयन्पुरवीथिकाम् ॥ २३ ॥

चटुलतारहचर्मतिरोहिताः करविधूनितखड्गलतायुताः ।
उरुभुजस्फुरदोषधिमूलिका वलययन्त्ववशेन समुद्गताः ॥ २४ ॥

स्वतनुलाघवदर्शनपूर्वकं बहुविधं रचितोत्प्लवनादिना ।
मुहुरुदायुधमत्र मुधा युधं निजजनैः सह निर्ममिरे परे ॥ २५ ॥

घनपरस्परघट्टननिध्वनद्गलदयोवलयोत्करपाणिभिः ।
कटिधृतायतकच्छकृशोदरैः क्वचिदियं समवापि च कौन्तिकैः ॥ २६ ॥

नयनकान्तिमवेत्य नभोत्पलप्रचुरतोरणपाशमधो धृते ।
प्रहरणप्रकरे पथि कौन्तिवैर्झटिति सौधजुषो जहसुः स्त्रियः ॥ २७ ॥

बहुविधेषु पटुत्वमथायुधेष्वनुकलं प्रतिपूरुषमद्भुतम् ।
प्रकटयत्प्रबलं बलमुर्वरावलरिपोरवलद्विशिखां प्रति ॥ २८ ॥

बलरजांसि महोवलशासिनः सकलदिग्वलयं समकोचयन् ।
अपगतान्किमरातिधरापतीन्सपदि शासितुमत्र समन्ततः ॥ २९ ॥

खचलनैर्बलिसद्मभुवा दिवं निबिडयद्रजसां निचयेन च ।
क्षितिपतेः किमु राज्यविवृद्धये त्रिजगदप्यवनीमतनोद्बलम् ॥ ३० ॥

सुरधुनी ध्वजिनीरजसाञ्जसा चुलुकिता समपूरि च भूरिभिः ।
विरुददुन्दुभिभीषणघोषणस्फुटदजाण्डबहिःस्रुतवारिभिः ॥ ३१ ॥

प्रथमसृष्टिकथापरिमार्जकैरपि बलस्य रजोभिरजोऽभितः ।
प्रसृमरैः परिचिन्त्य जगद्विधिं प्रमुमुदे परमाणुसमागमात् ॥ ३२ ॥

नभसि हन्त नदीपतिमेखलारमणसैन्यरजोभरपूरिते ।
असुमयादपरस्य तनूगतान्न कुहचिद्गतिरास नभस्वतः ॥ ३३ ॥

अथ कुसुम्भपटाहितवेष्टनश्रितविचित्रपतत्रशिरस्तटाः ।
घुसृणकर्दमगुम्फितकञ्चुका विरहिता दयया विनयेन च ॥ ३४ ॥

अतिरुषा परुषाक्षरभाषिणः समचलन्द्दशाङ्कुशया रयात् ।
अधिगता जवनान्यवना हयानधिपुरोविशिखे पथि केचन ॥ ३५ ॥

अतुलमाश्रमतिश्वसनं रयात्सपदि सादिकशाहतिचालितम् ।
अनवकाशमनन्तमनन्तरं विपुलमस्थगयद्विशिखास्थलम् ॥ ३६ ॥

खरजसा स्थलतामयमश्नुते किमिति शोधयितुं कृतचङ्क्रमाः ।
क्षितितलं नु विहाय विहायसे समवलन्त महीन्द्रचमूहयाः ॥ ३७ ॥

खनरपालकशत्रुपदं नदीपतिरचूर्ण्यत नः पदरेणुभिः ।
किमिति वीक्षितुमेव कृतोत्प्लुवा वियति दिद्युतिरे विभुघोटकाः ॥ ३८ ॥

हयखुराहतिभिः कृशया भुवा सपदि मांसलया समभूयत ।
प्रबलसादिपरस्परघट्टनत्रुटितलोहतनुत्ररजोभरैः ॥ ३९ ॥

खरतरस्वखुरक्रमणक्रमस्थलशिलाजनितज्वलनं रुषा ।
स्यदधुतानिलसख्यभुवा हयाः प्रतिमुहुश्च पदैः किमकुट्टयन् ॥ ४० ॥

सह सरत्यनिलश्चलचामरश्रित इति क्षितिशीतरुचो हयाः ।
निभृतचामरमस्य निवृत्तये निरगमन्किमु मानसरंहसः ॥ ४१ ॥

अधिगताः परिकंधरमञ्चितां विपुलमञ्चतटीं विधुताङ्कुशाः ।
मणिशिरस्त्रपुटस्तृतमैक्तिका गजतयाप्यगमन्कतिचिद्भटाः ॥ ४२ ॥

हरिदिभैर्विधृता स्वकुलाधिपैरतिलघुत्वमसावयति क्षितिः ।
इति मदाम्बुभरैरिभमण्डलो शमयति स्म चमूजनितं रजः ॥ ४३ ॥

शमयतीभघटा स्वमदैरिति क्षितिरजः किमदोऽजनि कार्मणम् ।
कटकटाहमरुन्द्ध तदन्तरभ्रमिपरभ्रमराश्मपुरःसरम् ॥ ४४ ॥

स्वविभुदानजलांसलमम्बुधिं स्थलयतीति रुषाशमयद्रजः ।
भुवि दिवि त्रिदिवेऽपि भृतं मदैः श्रुतिपुटैरपि सा करशीकरैः ॥ ४५

अत्र निजानिचमूहयरेणुभिः सलिलमामरसैन्धवमाविलम् ।
करिघटाकदलीघटितैः पटैः परमयत्नमभूत्परिशोधितम् ॥ ४६ ॥

हयखुराहतजातरजोभरैरपिहिते भवदम्बुजिनीहिते ।
करिघटाकरशीकरवारणात्सफलमातपवारणधारणम् ॥ ४७ ॥

वसुमतीतलवासत्रवाहिनीष्वथ गतास्वमितास्ववनीश्वराः ।
निरगमन्सममेव निजैर्निजैः परिवृताः कतिचित्प्रबलैर्बलैः ॥ ४८ ॥

नगरवीथिजुषां नलिनेक्षणाः सदनसौधसदः क्षितिरक्षिणाम् ।
विभवनामविभूषणवाहनान्यथ मिथः स्वसखीभिरकीर्तयन् ॥ ४९ ॥

यवनभूमिपतिः स यदाकृतिः शमनमातनुते शमितस्मयम् ।
विकृतवीक्षणनिष्ठुरभाषणक्षपितसौम्यनयक्षतसंधिभिः ॥ ५० ॥

अयमुपैति हयैरतिपौरुषैरिह वृतो मनसामिव मूर्तिभिः ।
तमवलोकय सादिशिरोमणिं त्वमिति काचिदुवाच सखीं प्रति ॥ ५१ ॥

सखि विलोकय सैन्धववाहनः प्रभुरयं परराजभयंकरः ।
भजति यस्य पुरं परितो नदीपतिरहो परिखावलयश्रियम् ॥ ५२ ॥

अयति तस्य विलम्बितमंसयोर्द्रमिडभूमिभृतः श्रवसोर्युगम् ।
विहृतिडोलिकयोर्विजयश्रियः सरणिमित्यपरा समभाषत ॥ ५३ ॥

गजपतिर्वसुधाकमिता पुरस्तरुणि पश्य स याति दयानिधिः ।
अधिगतो गजमभ्रमुवल्लभं विभुरिव त्रिदिवस्य विराजते ॥ ५४ ॥

निधिरसौ महसां निजसामजव्रजपरीतवपुर्व्रजति श्रियम् ।
परिवृतस्य दिनाधिपतेर्घनैरिति वचः समुदीरितमेकया ॥ ५५ ॥

नरपतिः स विभुर्नयनातिथिर्भवति भामिनि पश्य परंतपः ।
विमलहारधरो विजयश्रिया वृत इवात्र मधूकसुमस्रजा ॥ ५६ ॥

संवीतो मणिचतुरन्तयानवर्ती सैन्येन श्रयति स जह्नुकन्यकायाम् ।
राजीवान्तरगतराजहंसलक्ष्मीमित्येका वचनमुदीरयांचकार ॥ ५७ ॥

मनुजाधिपतिर्द्विषंतपोऽयं मगधः पुष्यरथोपरि स्थितोऽपि ।
स तु तिष्ठति रूपयोपरिष्टात्सकलानां सुतनो मनोरथानाम् ॥ ५८ ॥

मकुटं नवमणिखचितं स दधत्तरुणारुणांशुसमतेजाः ।
गिरिरिव गीर्वाणानां प्रासादो भाति रत्नमयशृङ्गः ॥ ५९ ॥

आशयं वक्तुमुन्मत्तहस्तिनः स्कन्धमास्थितः ।
अधःकृतावुद्धतानामित्याह गिरमेकिका ॥ ६० ॥

कोङ्कणभूरमणो मणिकङ्कणधारी स याति निःशङ्कः ।
सुषमा यस्य वितनुते विषमायुधमात्तगन्धमिन्दुमुखि ॥ ६१ ॥

अङ्गदं तस्य बाहायां संगतं मणिनिर्मितम् ।
विभाति भूचक्रमिवेत्यभाषत परा गिरम् ॥ ६२ ॥

गुर्जरपतिरयमयते निर्जरविभुर्विक्रमो महाभागः ।
अवलोकय विफलीकृतशिवलोचनवह्निरन्य इव मदनः ॥ ६३ ॥

खड्गं वहन्विशदरेखमसौ कराग्रे विश्वासपत्रमिव विद्विषतां विभाति ।
दत्तस्य वस्तविषयस्य ददामि नाकमित्यक्षराङ्कमिति काचिदुवाच वाचम् ॥

प्रासादाग्रसदः परस्परमिति प्रौढं वदन्त्यस्तदा
कामिन्यः स्वकटाक्षनीलकमलस्रग्भिः समभ्यार्चयन् ।
आरुह्य द्विरदेन्द्रमञ्जनगिरिप्रांशुं प्रतोल्यां शनै-
रायान्तं रघुनाथसिन्धुरशनाकान्तं लसन्तं श्रिया ॥ ६९ ॥

बहुलतरवारिधारामग्नान्सद्यः सपत्नमहिपालान् ।
तरणिं नीत्वा स्वस्थांस्तनुषे दययेति विनुत वीरजनैः ॥ ६६ ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपुप्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।
कविबुधगायकाभितकल्पनकल्पतरो जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥

प्रौढश्रीरघुनाथभूपतिकृपास्फारोभवत्साहिती-
साम्राज्यो निगमागमार्थनिपुणः श्रीयज्ञनारायणः ।
काव्ये पञ्चदशं च सर्गमतनोत्सोऽयं मखिग्रामणी-
रत्नाकद्वद विद्वदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ ६८ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-
चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्यासवाजपेययाजि-
गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-
याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ
साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये
पञ्चदशः सर्गः ।

षोडशः सर्गः ।

आरुह्य शृङ्गारितमौपशाह्यमायान्तमम्भोजदृशः प्रतोल्याम् ।
रतीशरूपं रघुनाथभूपमक्ष्णोरुपग्राह्यमथो वितेनुः ॥ १ ॥

नारी पुरासीद्रघुनाथनेतुः संस्पर्शतस्तस्य शिला सरण्याम् ।
आकारमस्य त्ववलोकयन्त्यो मोहादभूवन्नचला मृगाक्ष्यः ॥ २ ॥

अङ्गेषु रम्येषु विभोरकुर्वन्गतागतानि प्रमदाकटाक्षाः ।
शाखासु पूर्णस्तबकासु लेखसालस्य लोभादिव चञ्चरीकाः ॥ ३ ॥

तलोदरीभिर्मुहुराननं वा द्वयं दृशोर्वा भुजयोर्द्वयी वा ।
अदृश्यतासेचनकाखिलाङ्गकान्तेर्महीशीतकरस्य नान्यत् ॥ ४ ॥

एकैकमेवापघनं मृगाक्ष्यो विलोकयन्ति स्म विभोर्न चान्यम् ।
आलोकितो यद्यपरोऽपि ताभिः स विस्मृतस्तेन समीक्षितः प्राक् ॥ ५ ॥

आयाममक्ष्णोर्भुजयोश्च हर्षादस्यावनीन्द्रोरनुधावमानाः ।
दृशः समस्ताः सुदृशां चिरेण समश्रयन्त श्रवसी च जानू ॥ ६ ॥

कस्तूरिकाचित्रकमस्य फाले कर्णे तदासीदसितोवतंसः ।
उरःस्थले चोत्पलकॢप्तमाला कटाक्षशोभा कलभाषिणीनाम् ॥ ७ ॥

मङ्क्त्वा किरीटाग्रमणिप्रभायां कस्तूरिकां प्राप्य च कण्ठलिप्ताम् ।
श्मश्रूणि चोपास्य समं नृपेन्दोः स्त्रीणामपाङ्गद्युतिरंसलाभूत् ॥ ८ ॥

अर्घ्यं प्रमोदाश्रुभवैः कटाक्षमहःसुधाभिर्मधुपर्ककृत्यम् ।
अक्षीणि तासां विदधन्ति हर्षादक्षीणमातिथ्यममुष्य चक्रुः ॥ ९ ॥

दृशो विशालाः सुदृशां कटाक्षनीलाश्मलीलानलिकानिकायैः ।
निःसीमलावण्यरसान्निपीय न जातु तृप्ता रघुनाथनेतुः ॥ १० ॥

लक्ष्यं समग्रं ललना वितेनुस्तदीयरूपं सुदृशां सहैव ।
एतन्न चित्रं वसुवर्षकारि यत्स्थूललक्ष्यं प्रथते सुदृक्षु ॥ ११ ॥

अस्याभिरूप्यं हरिणेक्षणानामाकृष्टदाक्षिण्यवनोपरिण्यः ।
अयःशलाकावलिमग्रदेशस्थितामयस्कान्तशिला यथैव ॥ १२ ॥

लावण्यसिन्धौ रघुनाथनेतुर्मग्नस्य गाढं मनसस्तदानीम् ।
न तारकोऽभूत्तमध्यमानां प्रतारकः किं नु बभूव कन्तुः ॥ १३ ॥
विभुत्वमेके मनसो व्यजानन्नणुत्वमन्ये तु तयोरणुत्वम् ।
न्याय्यं तदेकत्र यतो न्यमाङ्क्षीत्प्रभाझरे पत्युरमुष्य धात्र्याः ॥ १४ ॥
स्वान्तान्यणूनि स्वत एव किं च मग्नानि लावण्यझरे महीन्दोः ।
ग्रहीतुमीशो न पितामहोऽपि कान्ताजनास्तत्र कथं प्रगल्भाः ॥ १५ ॥
चेतांसि दृग्भ्यो नरपालमेत्य स्थितानि तत्रैव वधूजनानाम् ।
अशक्नुवन्तीव पुनः प्रवेष्टुमानन्दबाष्पापिहितासु तासु ॥ १६ ॥
श्रितानि चेतांसि चिराय भूपं निर्गत्य नेत्रान्तरतो निमेषैः ।
सहामुना ताभिरथाहृतानि यदन्तरासामयमेधते स्म ॥ १७ ॥
अनेकधादृश्यत हन्त मोहान्नारीभिरेको रघुनाथनेता ।
पौलस्त्यसेनासु पुरा प्रयुक्तामधत्त मायामधुना किमेषः ॥ १८ ॥
नेत्राध्वना मे नृपतिः प्रविष्टो हृदन्तरं याति पुरेत्यवेत्य ।
निमीलिताक्षी सरणिर्निरुद्धा तस्येति काचित्तरुणी जहर्ष ॥ १९ ॥
स्रस्ते नृपालोकनसंभ्रमेण स्तनोत्तरीये स्तनयोरवेक्ष्य ।
तस्यानुबिम्बं विदती तमेव सखीं परा सादरमालिलिङ्ग ॥ २० ॥
परस्परामेक्ष्य पयोधरान्तर्बिम्बं महीजम्भभिदः प्रमोदात् ।
तमेव मत्वा तरसा भुजाभ्यामुभे तरुण्यावुपगूहतः स्म ॥ २१ ॥
परा नृपालोकनपारवश्यश्लथात्पतद्भिश्चिकुरात्प्रसूनैः ।
समावृताङ्गी सकलैरलोकि विद्धेव बाणैर्विषमायुधीयैः ॥ २२ ॥
स्रस्तोत्तरीयेण सखीसमक्षमाच्छाद्य संक्रान्तममुं कुचान्तः ।
आलोकयन्ती तदलाभतः काप्यन्तः प्रविष्टोऽयमिति प्रहृष्टा ॥ २३ ॥
संक्रान्तमप्यात्मशयात्मदर्शे सरागमेका न समीक्षते स्म ।
धरावलारिं परितस्तदीयानालोक्य तत्रानुचरान्विभीता ॥ २४ ॥
रागेण दृग्भ्यां रघुनाथभूपं रामा पिबन्ती रतिनाथरूपम् ।
इन्दुं करेणेव जिघृक्षुरेनमिच्छुर्विमोहादिति काचिदूचे ॥ २५ ॥

जयन्तदस्त्रप्रसवास्त्रसृङ्ख्या जातं पुरा यज्जलजासनस्य ।
असाधु तत्कौशलमद्य मन्ये लावण्यसृष्ट्या रघुनाथनेतुः ॥ २६ ॥

श्लिष्यन्ति या भूमिसितांशुमेनं ता एव धन्यास्तरलेक्षणासु ।
अन्यास्त्ववन्यामतिरूपधेयभाजोऽपि चित्रप्रतिमाविशेषाः ॥ २७ ॥

बाहे युवां प्राप्य ममाङ्कभूयं विभोरभूतं बत विप्रकृष्टे ।
सखी तु वां चम्पकमालिकेयं कण्ठं समाश्लिष्यति गाढमस्य ॥ २८ ॥

असावलभ्यो मम हन्त चित्तमेनं श्रितं वा पुनरेति चेन्माम् ।
तदास्मि धन्या न तदप्युपागादल्पेषु सौहार्दमतो न कार्यम् ॥ २९ ॥

कटाक्ष तुभ्यं कलये नमस्यामस्याधुनाश्लेषकृतार्थिताय ।
अङ्गेषु सर्वेषु तदङ्गपालीदूरेषु वैयर्थ्यधुरंधरेषु ॥ ३० ॥

आकाररेखामवनीवलारेरालोक्य मोहादिति भाषमाणाम् ।
निश्चित्य तस्मिन्निहिताभिलाषां प्रौढा सखीमित्यपरा बभाषे ॥ ३१ ॥

वशीकरोत्येव वधूः कदापि स्वयं न वश्यः स्वदमानचापः ।
तत्कोटिसाम्यं दधदेष मूर्त्या वश्यः कथं ते वसुधासुधांशुः ॥ ३२ ॥

प्रेष्या कटाक्षस्य पयोधिकन्या वाचां सवित्री वचसोऽपि यस्य ।
प्रसमृत्य भर्तारमिमे भजेते सोऽयं कथं ते सुलभो नरेन्द्रः ॥ ३३ ॥

आत्मानमाकर्षति रूपमस्येत्यस्मिन्न विश्वासमये विधेहि ।
महीमहेन्द्रस्य मनस्तदेतत्सरोजनेत्रे सहते न यस्मात् ॥ ३४ ॥

लोकत्रयीलोलविलोचनानां प्रतारकः पञ्चशरः स्वमूर्त्या ।
प्रतारकस्तस्य च पार्थिवोऽसौ कथं विधेयस्तव कातराक्षि ॥ ३५ ॥

अथाच्युतक्षोणिवलाभियातेर्जयन्तमेनं जगतीपरिण्यम् ।
विलोकयन्ती विविधैर्वचोभिरवर्णयत्काचिदमुष्य रूपम् ॥ ३६ ॥

आलोक्य सौन्दर्यममुष्य रत्याः पतिव्रतात्वे सति भज्यमाने ।
करोति रोषं न ततः परं तु कन्तुः स पत्नीति धिया तमस्यै ॥ ३७ ॥

विजित्य कामं विभया तदीयं धुनोति चायं सुहृदं मुखेन ।
श्वासेन वाहं ध्वजमीक्षणेन कैश्येन गव्यं कवनेन चापम् ॥ ३८ ॥

सुरूपशाली न विधुः सुमेषुर्नाह्लादको नैव वृतौ श्रिया तौ ।
भ्रातृत्वपुत्रत्वभृतेस्तदस्य सर्वैर्गुणैः किं समता तयोः स्यात् ॥ ३९ ॥

हित्वोत्तमं च स्वमियाय कार्ष्ण्यं परः पुमान्पाटलतां विधाता ।
ईशो वलक्षत्वमपीति खिन्ना हव्यत्यमुं प्राप्य हिरण्यकान्तिः ॥ ४० ॥

अमुष्य देहांशुसवर्णतायै स्वर्णं स्वजन्मावधि साधु तप्तम् ।
पञ्चाग्निमध्यं प्रविशत्फलं तत्प्राप्नोति न प्रत्युत कार्श्यमेव ॥ ४१ ॥

मत्कर्णिकामस्य तनूमहोभिः समां विधेहीति विधेः सरोजम् ।
तत्साधनं च स्वयमेव बिभ्रत्परागमर्घासनतां प्रयाति ॥ ४२ ॥

प्रभोर्विधायाङ्गविभां परः किमेवं सृजेदेतदिति स्मयेन ।
परीक्षितुं तत्करणैः परागैः सहासृजच्चम्पकमब्जपीठः ॥ ४३ ॥

अमुष्य देहांशुलवैकसाम्याद्धृता वधूभिः स्तनयोर्हरिद्रा ।
सर्वात्मना तत्समता यदि स्यादस्यास्तदा कोऽतिशयो न जाने ॥ ४४ ॥

गोरोचना क्षोणिपतेरमुष्य शरीरशोभाभरसाम्यसिद्ध्यै ।
चूर्णीभवन्ती यतते सुखेन सद्भिः कथं वा समता घटेत ॥ ४५ ॥

प्रभुर्मम स्वप्रभया विजेता तथाप्यसौ मां शिरसा दधाति ।
इति त्रसन्संभृतहीरदम्भात्स्विन्नः किमु स्वर्णमयः किरीटः ॥ ४६ ॥

प्रायेण दास्यत्ययमर्थिने मां भवाम्यदेयोऽहमिति क्षितीन्दोः ।
किरीटतामेत्य गिरिः सुराणां मुक्ताभिराभाति हसन्मुदेव ॥ ४७ ॥

विधुर्वसन्तो मदनो विधाता विधाय सर्वेऽपि विभोर्ललाटम् ।
ज्ञातुं किल स्वस्वविधानमेभिर्लेखात्रयीयं लिखितात्र भाति ॥ ४८ ॥

कस्तूरिकाकल्पितमस्य किंचिद्विशालमग्रे तिलकं विभाति ।
भास्वन्मुखेन्दुप्रभयेव सामि हसन्मुखं मेचकमम्बुजातम् ॥ ४९ ॥

एतस्य दीर्घाकृतिरेणनाभिविशेषकः पञ्चशरो विभाति ।
भ्रूवल्लिदम्भेन भुजौ प्रसार्य दैर्घ्यं दृशोः किं धरणीपरिण्यः ॥ ५० ॥

श्रुतं समस्तं वसुधासुधांशोर्यज्जायते दृष्टमिव प्रकामम् ।
दृशोरमुष्य श्रवसोश्च नित्यसंबन्धजन्मा महिमा स एषः ॥ ५१ ॥

नेत्रे महीनेतुरमुष्य दूरस्थितं च कर्णद्वयमाक्रमिष्टाम् ।
आक्रामतो मामपि मध्यभाजमित्युन्नतत्वं भजतीव नासा ॥ ५२ ॥

स्पर्धावशेनास्य परस्परस्य दृशौ भजन्त्याविति दीर्घभावम् ।
उदीक्षितुं प्रापि किमुन्नतत्वं मध्यस्थया नासिकया महीन्दोः ॥ ५३ ॥

मुखेन्दुलावण्यमुधासुधाब्धौ क्रीडत्सु चित्तेषु कृशोदरीणाम् ।
श्मश्रुच्छलेनापसृता महीन्दोः पार्श्वद्वये शैवलपङ्क्तिरेव ॥ ५४ ॥

गलद्वये कर्णिकयोरमुष्य भान्त्यष्ट मुक्ताः प्रतिबिम्बबाजः ।
उच्चार्यमाणानि रघूद्वहस्य मन्त्राक्षराणीव बहिः स्फुरन्ति ॥ ५५ ॥

अमुं श्रयिष्यन्त्यपराणि भूषावृत्तीनि रत्नानि विना प्रवालम् ।
इत्यस्य साफल्यमिव प्रदातुं व्यधान्महीन्दोरधरं विधाता ॥ ५६ ॥

कान्तानुरक्ताधरसंनिधानात्स्वच्छापि तद्वद्भवतु द्विजालिः ।
अवाप्य नेत्रे श्रुतिमध्यमुष्य कान्तानुरागं कथमादधाते ॥ ५७ ॥

सुधार्द्रसूक्तेर्वसुधासुधांशोः फणीश्वरोऽमुष्य भजेत साम्यम् ।
स्वभावतो येन वचस्तदीयं विषानलज्वालविशेषदक्षम् ॥ ५८ ॥

आशीविषेन्दोरमृतोक्तिता चेदध्यापकस्याप्यमृताशनानाम् ।
सहस्रधा चेत्प्रतिपादकत्वं स्थाने तयोरस्य तदा समत्वम् ॥ ५९ ॥

आवर्तनादार्जितमागमानां जाड्यं चतुर्णां जलजासनेन ।
संत्यज्यते सांप्रतमेष भूत्वा चतुर्विधेऽपि प्रभवन्कवित्वे ॥ ६० ॥

प्रबन्धमात्मन्यकरोत्प्रसिद्धं वाल्मीकिरादाविति वाग्विलासैः ।
स एव रामस्तनुते स्म तस्मिन्भूत्वा निबन्धं रघुनाथभूपः ॥ ६१ ॥

सयत्नमाहृत्य सुहृत्प्रमोदं स पारिजातं हरिरब्दमेकम् ।
अधाद्यं त्वस्य कथां निबध्नन्नयत्नमाकल्पमहो तनोति ॥ ६२ ॥

रामायणोक्तौ रघुनाथनेता प्राचेतसादप्यजनि प्रतीतः ।
तत्रान्यवृत्तं वदतः स्वकीयवृत्तस्य वक्तुश्च न किं विशेषः ॥ ६३ ॥

पराजितानि क्षितिपाकभेत्तुः कण्ठेन किं कम्बुकदम्बकानि ।
न्ययुञ्जतामुष्य निषेवणाय निजात्मजा निस्तलहारमुक्ताः ॥ ६४ ॥

वीरेन्दिरानित्यविहारबाहाप्रासादयोर्भूषणजालभाजोः ।
अत्युन्नतौ हाटककूटलक्ष्मीमंसौ धराधीशितुरादधाते ॥ ६५ ॥

रत्नाङ्गदाभालहरीपरीते प्रभोर्भुजे पार्श्वधुतप्रकीर्णे ।
संभावयन्त्यौ स्वभवप्रतापात्कीर्तिप्ररोहौ किममुष्य भातः ॥ ६६ ॥

रत्नाङ्गदस्फुरितराजकुलानुबिम्बा बाहुद्वयी बलिभिदो विलसत्यमुष्य ।
संचिन्त्य बाहुजनुषां समरेऽवसानं भूयोऽपि ताञ्जनयितुं भुवि गर्भिणीव ॥

अत्यायतत्वमतिमांसलताममुष्य बाहुद्वयी महिवलासुहृदौ भजन्तौ ।
पूर्वावतारविधृतं भुजयुग्ममन्यत्स्वामिन्प्रविष्टमिति संप्रति शंसतीव ॥ ६८ ॥

चाञ्चल्यमङ्घ्रितना स्वममुञ्चदस्य
स्थित्वाभिवक्ष इति सिन्धुभवाः किमन्ये ।
आत्मस्वपि स्थिरतरातिशयाय वक्षो-
हाराः श्रयन्ति विविधा मणयोऽप्यमुष्य ॥ ६९ ॥

वक्षो भात्यसुहृन्मनोरथगतिद्वारोपरोधि प्रभोः
सौवर्णं विपुलं कवाटमुपरिस्थानेन्दिराचित्रितम् ।
पार्श्वद्वन्द्वसुयोजितस्थिरमहाबाहार्गलाभासुरं
चारुश्मश्रुपरंपरासितपयोजातोन्मिषत्तोरणम् ॥ ७० ॥

निरङ्कुशो नृपतिलकः क्षमाभृतो निरीक्षितो नमयति योऽखिलानपि ।
स सिन्धुरं चलयितुमेव पाणिना वहत्यसौ बत नसितमङ्कुशं कथम् ॥

पार्श्वे प्रमृष्टे इव पार्थिवेन्दोर्मेयं वलग्नं करमुष्टिनेव ।
कान्तौ त्वचा हस्तिकराविवोरू मुग्धौ च जानू मुकुराविवास्य ॥ ७२ ॥

स्कन्धे गजस्य चलता श्रुतिचामरेण
पादाङ्गदं वितपते नृपतेः स्थिरस्य ।
आलक्षितं क्षणमलक्षितमात्तरत्नं
बिम्बं वनेन शरदीव विभो रुचीनाम् ॥ ७३ ॥

अम्लानाभिरपास्तरञ्जुनहनक्लेशाभिरम्भोरुह-

स्रग्भिः सौधजुषामपाङ्गजनिभिः सश्लाघमेणीदृशाम् ।

आयुष्मान्रघुनाथभूमिपरिणोरभ्यर्चितो भूयसा

संजातप्रमदो बलेन निरगात्तञ्जापुरीतो बहिः ॥ ७४ ॥

भू...................... रभावा-

त्कोपप्रसादौ धरणीश्वरेषु ।

उन्मूलनेनाधिकरक्षणेना-

प्युदीरय .... पण्डितौघैः ॥ ७५ ॥

जलनिधिगर्भवासवशनिर्भरदर्परिपु-

प्रतिहतिहेतुसेतुकृतिनूतनदाशरथे ।

कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो

जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥ ७६ ॥

प्रौढश्रीरघुनाथभूपतिकृपास्फारीभवत्साहितो-

साम्राज्यो निगमागमार्थनिपुणः श्रीयज्ञनारायणः ।

सर्गं षोडशमप्यपूरयदयं स ग्रामणीर्यज्वना-

मत्राकद्रुदविद्रदद्भुतकरे साहित्यरत्नाकरे ॥ ७७ ॥

इति श्रीपदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणश्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्यसाग्नि-

चित्यसर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्याप्तवाजपेययाजि-

गोविन्ददीक्षितवरनन्दनस्य साग्निचित्यसर्वक्रतु-

याजिनः श्रीयज्ञनारायणयज्वनः कृतौ

साहित्यरत्नाकरे महाकाव्ये

षोडशः सर्गः ।